ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

74.1
Stephen
istory of the
hurch of Scotland
St4h
v.1
1868908
STORAGE

DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS FROM POCKET

PUBLIC LIBRARY
FORT WAYNE AND ALLEN COUNTY, IND.

STO

ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

4484

THE

HISTORY

OF THE

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,

FROM THE

Reformation to the Present Time.

BY

THOMAS STEPHEN,

AUTHOR OF "THE BOOK OF THE CONSTITUTION;"
"THE GUIDE TO THE MORNING AND EVENING SERVICE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,"
ETC. ETC.

IN FOUR VOLUMES;

WITH TWENTY-FOUR PORTRAITS ENGRAVED ON STEEL.

VOL. I.

V.1

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR

LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS,

PATERNOSTER ROW.

1848

1868908



London
Wilson and Ogilvy, 57, Skinner Street, Snowhill.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/historyofchurcho0001thom

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

Page

Primacy of Archbishop James Beaton—from 1522 to 1539 ... 1

CHAPTER II.

Primacy of Archbishop David Beaton, Cardinal, Legatus natus, and Legate à Latere—from 1540 to 1546..... 12

CHAPTER III.

Primacy of Archbishop Hamilton—from 1546 to 1558 36

CHAPTER IV.

Primacy of Archbishop Hamilton—from 1558 to 1560 65

CHAPTER V.

Government—Worship—Faith—Opinions of the Scottish and Foreign Reformers—1561 105

CHAPTER VI.

The Superintendents—from 1561 to 1567..... 149

CHAPTER VII.

The Superintendents and Titular Bishops—from 1568 to 1574... 206

CHAPTER VIII.

The Titular primacies of John Douglas and Patrick Adamson. From the first proposal of Presbytery to the erection of the first Court of Presbytery—from 1575 to 1592..... 256

CHAPTER IX.

Page
The Death of Mary Queen of Scots 349

CHAPTER X.

The Presbyterian Establishment—from 1593 to 1600 371

CHAPTER XI.

From the Restoration of Titular Episcopacy to the Consecration of Three Bishops in London—from 1600 to 1610..... 417

CHAPTER XII.

Primacy of Gladstanes and Spottiswood—from 1611 to 1625 ... 459

CHAPTER XIII.

Primacies of Archbishop Spottiswood, from the Accession of Charles I. till the Riot on account of the Liturgy—from 1525 to 1637 511

CHAPTER XIV.

Primacy of Archbishop Spottiswood—the Tables, the Covenant, the Glasgow Assembly, and the Destruction of the Church —1638 565

CHAPTER XV.

Conclusion 637

PREFACE.

In submitting to the public a new history of the ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland, it will perhaps displease some readers to find, in the contents of this volume, so much that is opposed to the opinions and representations of other historians of the period embraced therein; but facts have been honestly detailed, as they have been vouched for by the contemporary authors on both sides of politics. The episcopalian Spottiswood, and the presbyterian Calderwood, correspond exactly in their accounts of the most material facts, although they differ most essentially in their opinions, and in their deductions from the same premises. Facts, however, are stubborn things, and cannot, without detriment to truth, be turned and moulded to suit peculiar or sectarian views. The truth of history has been strictly adhered to, without respect of persons; quotations have not been garbled; nor have either friends or adversaries been designedly misrepresented. Such disingenuousness was foreign to the principles on which this work was written; for if an account shall be demanded at the day of judgment for every idle word that we speak, how much stricter will the scrutiny be into those falsehoods or wilful misrepresentations which we may commit to writing.

Both Knox and Melville were straight-forward and consistent in the establishment of their different systems. The former was too fearless, in the means which he adopted to accomplish his ends, to create any ambiguity to the historian

who honestly intended to write the truth, and nothing but the truth. The latter appeared on the scene at a later period, and with other and more democratic views. He introduced an entirely different system, utterly subversive of Knox's discipline. He created dissention, and lived in contention. He was republican in his views, but ambitious of more than papal supremacy in his own person; and he laid the foundation of that religious discord which may be traced in the following pages, and of that separation, schism, and consequent bloodshed and persecution, which has yet to be detailed.

The conduct of the most conspicuous of the ministers who had been bred at the feet of these men, or had adopted their views, will admit of little palliation; for the passions of "hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings," by which they were actuated, were works of the flesh which inferred the pains of disinheritance from the kingdom of heaven, but which were then extremely common. Their violence is admitted by Dr. Robertson, himself a presbyterian minister, who says, "the *pulpit* was disgraced by being used as a vehicle to *revile* the sovereign, and to *stir up contention* among the people." The circumstance which will make the following history more interesting to English readers is, that the destruction of the church of England, and the persecution of her clergy in the seventeenth century, were the effects of the Scottish Solemn League and Covenant. The same agency was at work, and the same objects contemplated, by the jesuits, when they instigated the covenanters to extirpate the reformed Catholic church in all the three kingdoms, and their maxim that the end justifies the means was then fully verified.

The extensive and better cultivated estates of the prelates and monastic bodies excited in the breasts of the nobility that desire for plunder which was the great and enduring sin of the Scottish reformation. Every man at that time did that which was right in his own eyes, indifferent whether he

robbed God or his neighbour; and the sceptre was wielded by too feeble hands to be any restraint on powerful and lawless barons, at the head of their feudal vassals. Each reforming baron, therefore, seized on the lands nearest to his own hereditary property; while the abbots and priors then in possession secured what remained, and procured their erection into temporal lordships, descendible to their children or heirs. Nearly one-third of the land of the kingdom was thus appropriated; and Knox's efforts to recover a maintenance for his hierarchy out of the wreck, was ridiculed as a *devout imagination*. This spoliation, with the withholding of the tithes, the subsequent uniting of contiguous parishes, and the extreme scarcity of men, able, either for learning or morality, to undertake the ministerial office, left the people scattered as sheep on the hills without a shepherd, and kept them for a time in a state of knowledge and morality little superior to heathens, that has ever since operated most injuriously on the Scottish church. The attempt of the crown to secure a moderate revenue for the clergy instantly created the utmost alarm in the minds of the nobility, lest they should be stript of the whole of the property which had formerly belonged to the church, and which they tenaciously grasped. Divine wrath visited their sacrilege with the national punishments of the sword, famine, and pestilence, the extirpation of the established churches of the three kingdoms, the prostration of monarchical government, a bloody revolution, the murder of the king, and the establishment of a military despotism.

King's College, London,
18 October, 1843.

HISTORY

OF THE

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

CHAPTER I.

PRIMACY OF ARCHBISHOP JAMES BEATON.

Reformation necessary.—James Resby—Paul Craw—Lollards of Kyle prosecuted—Subjects of their Discourses.—Hamilton Abbot of Ferme—his preaching—trial and burning.—John Knox.—William Arithe.—Alexander Seton's preaching.—Alexander Aless.—Many tried for heresy.—The tenth of benefices granted to the king.—Return of Bishop David Beaton.—An episcopal synod—Several tried for heresy—Six burnt in one fire.—Anecdote of the Bishop of Dunkeld and the Vicar of Dollar—the vicar of Dollar burnt.—Russell and Kennedy burnt—Russell's speech at the stake.—George Buchanan.—Cardinal Beaton.—More burning.—Death of Archbishop James Beaton.—Reflections.

At the period when the reformed doctrines were first introduced into Scotland, the papal hierarchy enjoyed the most profound repose, and possessed the greatest possible security in the support of the throne and of the aristocracy. The alterations of religion which took place during two minorities of the crown, in the sixteenth century, have rendered the history of the Scottish Reformation one of considerable interest, and of some importance, both in its immediate effects, and also in the consequences which have flowed from the manner in which it was conducted. Some of the first preachers of the reformed doctrines were Romish priests, but many of them were merely zealous laymen who undertook the sacred office. The number of ecclesiastics at that time in Scotland, of every description, exceeded two thousand, although the general population of the kingdom did not much exceed a million of souls. To the Scottish prelates that

kingdom is indebted for most of its improvements in the arts and sciences known to the age in which they lived. "We are not, however," says Mr. Lawson[1], "to view the ecclesiastics of the Scottish hierarchy merely as the founders of cathedrals, colleges, and religious institutions. It cannot be denied that they rendered essential services, by their continued improvement of the kingdom, in agriculture; in the erection of bridges, hospitals for the aged and infirm, many of which still remain; and they were, in many cases, the promoters of the comforts and luxuries of domestic life. They were the discoverers of that invaluable mineral *coal*, a constant and never-failing source of internal wealth; they were long the only ship-owners of the kingdom; and some of the most useful inventions issued from the monastic cloister. Secure in their hold over their numerous vassals and retainers, the dignitaries of the Scoto-Catholic hierarchy appear never to have contemplated the possibility of attack."

In every age of the Church, even in its most corrupt state, the Lord of the Vineyard never left himself without some witnesses for the truth; and His all-seeing eye could reckon the thousands in Israel who had never bent their knees to the corruptions of the church in their several generations, but who secretly worshipped him in spirit and in truth. He raised up Wickliff in the fifteenth century, to protest against the corruptions of the papal system, and to sow some seeds of truth, which sprang up and bore fruit in a subsequent generation. The general degeneration of the Popish clergy in Scotland disgusted all men in whom the least spark of true religious feeling remained; but the monastic orders appear to have been wholly given up to the most impure lusts, and to all the works of the flesh. Notwithstanding they made the most unbounded pretensions to austerity of manners and sanctity of heart, in reality they were universally stained with the deepest hypocrisy, and they privately indulged in unrestrained sensuality and lust. Wickliff's attempt to translate the Holy Scriptures into the vulgar tongue, and his exposure of some of the errors of Popery, made many secret converts in England, who were denominated Lollards; and many of whom were driven by persecution into Scotland, to seek protection from the fury of their papal oppressors.

The first of these was James Resby, a priest; who was summoned before Lawrence Lindores, who then held the office of Papal Inquisitor-General, in the year 1422. He is said

[1] The Roman Catholic Church in Scotland, p. 15.

chiefly to have taught "that the Pope was *not* the vicar of Christ; and that a man of a wicked life ought not to be acknowledged as Pope." He was pronounced guilty of heresy, and committed to the secular arm, and burnt alive, at St. Andrew's, during the primacy of Henry Wardlaw, then the *primus Scotiæ Episcopus*[1].

Some years afterwards, a Bohemian physician, named Paul Craw, a deputy from the reformers of Prague, ventured into Scotland, to open a communication with the opponents of Popery; from which it would appear that Resby's doctrines had made some progress. Craw was apprehended in St. Andrew's, and arraigned before Lindores as a heretic. He was accused of following the heretical opinions of Huss and Wickliff respecting the Sacrament of the Altar, and of having denounced auricular confession and prayers to saints departed. He was of course condemned, and burnt alive at St. Andrew's, in the year 1431[2].

Although the government took no notice of these cruel proceedings, yet they seem to have had a sedentary effect upon the people, for no farther opposition appears to have been given to the papal doctrines till the year 1494, in the sixth year of the reign of James IV., when no less than thirty persons of both sexes were summoned before Robert Blackadder, Archbishop of Glasgow, and accused of heretical pravity. They were chiefly from Kyle, a district of the county of Ayr, and hence they were denominated the "Lollards of Kyle." Knox enumerates thirty-four articles which were preferred against them: some of which were, that they maintained "that images were not to be had in the Kirk, nor to be worshipped;"—"that the relics of saints are not to be worshipped;"—"that it is not lawful *to fight* for the faith;"—"that Christ gave power to bind and loose to all the Apostles, and not to Peter alone, and his successors:"—"that after consecration there remains bread, and that there is not in the mass the *natural* body of Christ;"—"that the Pope deceives the people by his Bulls and Indulgences, and that the souls said to be in purgatory are not profited by masses;"—"that the Pope exalts himself against and above God;"—"that priests may have wives;"—that faith should not be given to (Popish) miracles;"—"that prayers should not be addressed to the Blessed Virgin;"—"that such as worship the Sacrament (of the Altar) commit idolatry," &c. It appears that the king himself was present at their trial, and

[1] Knox's Hist. of the Reformation, p. 63. [2] Knox's History.

recommended a merciful course to be adopted, and the Archbishop dismissed them with an admonition merely to beware of false doctrines and novelties in religion[1].

1528.—There does not appear to have been any farther notice taken of religious opinions, and men seem to have enjoyed them in secret. The fatal battle of Flodden deprived the country of the king and its principal nobility, and the distractions of the regency gave another direction to public opinion. The alterations in religion, made by the caprice of Henry VIII. in England, however, alarmed the Scottish bishops, and induced them to make more particular inquiries after heretical pravity. The renown of the bold monk who shook the papal throne to its foundation, had reached the northern kingdom; and Mr. Patrick Hamilton, travelling into Germany, imbibed the reformed doctrines from the lips of Melancthon. Hamilton, whose father was the laird of Kinkavil, and captain of the State Prison of Blackness Castle, was promoted by royal favour, while only a boy, to be Abbot of Ferme, in Rosshire. On his return from the continent, in his public discourses, although not in holy orders, he exposed the gross and unconcealed corruptions of the church, and the errors, both of doctrine and worship, which had polluted the face of religion. He first converted his brother and sister-in-law, with some of their neighbours in the county of Linlithgow, of which the elder Hamilton was the sheriff. He preached chiefly in those parts where he could enjoy the protection of the powerful house of Hamilton; and "his addresses produced a wonderful impression on his hearers, who listened with astonishment to the bold and startling truths of the undaunted preacher. His youth, his high connexions, his superior genius and learning, admitted by all writers, which had become refined by the literature and philosophy of the continent, and his interesting and elegant appearance, for it is said his external accomplishments were of no ordinary description, produced an impression as favourable for the dissemination of the truth as it was calculated to alarm the authorities of the church[2]."

His success alarmed the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, who deceitfully invited him to a conference, and, the more readily to deceive him, admitted that many things as then practised in the church required reformation. Alexander Campbell, a friar, treacherously drew from him his whole opinions respect-

[1] Knox's History, pp. 64, 65.
[2] Lawson's Roman Catholic Church in Scotland, 37, 38.

ing the state of the church, and appeared against him as his accuser at his trial. He was arraigned before Archbishop James Beaton, assisted by Gavin Douglass, Archbishop of Glasgow, and condemned on the usual charge of heresy, on the last day of February, 1528; and was burnt alive that same afternoon, before the gate of St. Salvador's College. His sufferings at the stake were great; for, from the freshness of the combustibles, the unhappy youth was only partially burnt, and it was necessary to send for gunpowder to finish the tragedy. Whilst suffering the excruciating agonies of a slow fire, Hamilton prayed firmly for the enlightenment of his country and the forgiveness of his implacable enemies, and died faintly uttering, "*Lord Jesus, receive my spirit:*" which it is fervently to be hoped that He did. "His patience and constancy," says Bishop Keith, "in the midst of the flames, were so remarkable that many persons scrupled not to say that *he died a true martyr of Christ*[1]."

He was hurried to the stake the same afternoon, lest the king, who had gone on a pilgrimage to St. Duthacs, in Rosshire, should have prevented that horrid tragedy, which was intended to strike terror into the minds of those who might be inclined to adopt the reformed doctrines. It had, however, the opposite effect; for Keith says, in all quarters of the country, men began to inquire into the articles for which he had been so severely treated. The youth, intelligence, and resignation of the sufferer, excited an unusual sympathy in his favour, and of odium towards his judges and the perfidious friar who had been his accuser, and tended greatly to the advancement of the reformed doctrines on the minds of those who saw or heard of this unchristian deed. Among those who witnessed the martyrdom of Hamilton, was the celebrated JOHN KNOX, who was then a divinity student at the University; a man made of sterner stuff than the amiable martyr, and destined to uproot and destroy that church of which he, soon after this event, became a priest. In all respects, says Mr. Lawson, "Hamilton was the mildest and the most devoted, as he was the most highly descended, of those who suffered for religion in Scotland during the last days of the Romish hierachy. While the others have been generally either too obscure, or too much connected with political events, to have their characters fairly represented, *that of Hamilton is without a single stain or reproach.* His

[1] Keith's Hist. of Ch. and State, p. 8.—Lawson's R. C. C. in S., p. 47.—Knox's Hist. 66.

offering seems to have been pure and spontaneous to the cause of truth. When Luther heard of his fate, that bold reformer burst into tears; and Melancthon also wept over one whose mildness, gentleness, and inquiring mind, had interested their attention during his short stay at Wittemberg[1]."

The author of Knox's History alleges that the re-action now became general, and that even in the University of St. Andrew's a professor, Gavin Logie, began to admit some glimmerings of the truth into his class-room. He mentions a friar, of the name of William Arithe, who preached publicly at Dundee, and exposed the abuses of the whole ecclesiastical state, but especially the most immoral lives of the Conventual Orders of both sexes. He was supported by John Major, a man of European reputation, and he delivered the same discourse at St. Andrew's, when he especially denounced the Chapel of our Lady of Karsegrange, which was a favourite resort of female penitents for confession; but he strongly recommended the "honest men of St. Andrew's, if ye love your wives and daughters, hold them at home, or else send them in good honest company; for if ye knew what miracles were wrought there, ye would neither thank God nor our Lady." After such an exposure of their immorality, in which he openly accused the clergy of adultery and fornication, he fled into England; and we hear nothing farther of him[2].

The cruel martyrdom of Mr. Hamilton made a profound impression on the people; and some even of the monks themselves began to declaim openly against the lewdness and immorality of their brethren. In the season of Lent which succeeded the burning of Hamilton, Alexander Seton, a Dominican friar, and confessor to king James V., was appointed to preach, and he intrepidly advanced some of the new doctrines, and boldly declared the virtues which St. Paul requires in a faithful bishop. He insisted likewise that the law of God was the sole rule of righteousness, and that the pardon of sin could only be obtained by sincere repentance, through the alone merits of our crucified Saviour. His uncompromising rebukes of the besetting sin of the clergy of that age, gave deep offence to the archbishop, but his station in the king's household protected him from immediate vengeance. Little difficulty was found, however, in accomplishing his disgrace at court, as the king had already begun to look coldly on him for having reproved his own loose and

[1] The Roman Cath. Ch. in Scotland, 50.—Keith's Hist. 8.—Knox's Hist. 66.
[2] Knox's Hist. 72, 73.

immoral life. He judged it prudent, therefore, to retire into England, where he experienced that persecution in the reign of Queen Mary, which he strove to avoid at home. He officiated as chaplain in the family of the Duke of Suffolk, and died in the year 1542[1].

The next victim was Henry Forrest, a Benedictine monk, who was burnt alive for maintaining that the doctrines taught by the abbot of Ferne were good and commendable, that they might be defended, and that he died a martyr. These sentiments were uttered in the confidence of auricular confession, and which, contrary to the oath of secresy, were produced against him on his trial. As the Church of Rome wages a war of extermination against the Holy Scriptures, which were written for our learning, a prominent count in his indictment was that he had a copy of the New Testament in his possession. He was condemned and burnt alive at the north gate of the Priory. Whilst deliberating on the place where he should be burnt, John Lindsay, one of the archbishop's gentlemen, recommended that Friar Forrest should be burnt in some cellar, for he assured the clergy that "*the smoke of Mr. Patrick Hamilton hath infected all them on whom it blew!*"[2] Alexander Aless, whom Heylin justly calls "*a right learned Scot*," John Fife, John Machee, commonly called Dr. Macabeus, and one Macdougal, were summoned to answer to charges of heretical pravity; but not coveting the crown of martyrdom, they fled into Holland; and not appearing, they were sentenced to suffer the usual pains and penalties of heresy. In the year 1534, Archbishop James Beaton held a court for the trial of heresy, at which James V. himself presided; and James Hay, bishop of Ross, sat as commissioner for the archbishop. Sir William Kirk, Adam Davis, Henry Kernes, John Stewart, William Johnston, advocate, Henry Henderson, school-master, and several others, were placed at the bar. Most of these abjured their opinions, and burnt their faggots or bills, as they were called. The court condemned David Straiton, gentleman, and Norman Gourley, to be burnt, although the king urged them much to recant and burn their bills. They were both burnt alive at the same fire, on the same afternoon, at the Rood of Greenside, which now makes part of the New Town of Edinburgh. To render the king more hearty in spreading the *scarlet mark* of the Roman Church, and to excite his cupidity, the pope granted him the tenth of all ecclesiastical

[1] Keith's Hist.; Knox's do. 76. [2] 1 Keith, 8. Spottiswood's History.

benefices for the space of three years. In consequence several acts of parliament were passed in the year 1535, against "the damnable opinions of the great heretic Martin Luther[1]."

1539.—Bishop DAVID BEATON, who was also abbot of Arbroath, had been absent on the continent, but in May of the preceding year he returned, accompanied by Mary of Lorraine, widow of the Duke of Longueville. She was married to James V. in the Cathedral of St. Andrew's by the abbot of Arbroath, and was the mother of the unfortunate Queen Mary. An episcopal synod was held in Edinburgh, where the affairs of the church were investigated, and several individuals tried for heresy. John Lyn, a grey friar, John Kellore, and John Beveredge, black friars, Sir Duncan Simpson, priest, Robert Forrester, gent. and dean Thomas Forrest, a canon regular of St. Colms-Inch and vicar of Dollar, in Perthshire, were cited to answer to charges of heresy, and condemned to die, and were all cruelly burnt alive in one fire on the Castle-hill of Edinburgh, on the 28th of February. Some time previously, the bishop of Dunkeld challenged the vicar of Dollar for preaching every Sunday to his parishioners on the Epistle and Gospels for the day. The bishop advised him to discontinue this laudable course, adding, that if the vicar "could find a good epistle or good gospel, that setteth forth the liberty of the holy church, he might instruct his people in that; but to let the rest alone: for, I thank God," continued the bishop, "that I have lived well these many years, and never knew either the Old or New Testament. I am contented with my missal and my breviary; and if you, dean Thomas, leave not these fantasies, you will have cause to repent."[2] The good vicar pulled a copy of the new Testament from his pocket at the stake, which was rudely snatched from him by Lauder, the official or archdeacon of Lothian, who impiously called it a *book of heresy!* "God forgive you, brother," said Forrest; "you ought not to call the book of the evangel of Jesus Christ the book of heresy." But, true to the letter and the spirit of the Church of Rome, Lauder retorted, "knowest thou not that it is contrary to *our canons* and *express commands* to have a New Testament or Bible in English, *and that this of itself is enough to condemn thee?*[3]"

The next victims were Jeremy Russell, a priest of the order of the grey friars, and a young gentleman of the name of Kennedy, a youth under eighteen years of age,

[1] Spottiswood—Knox, 77-78; Keith, 9.
[2] Spottiswood, Keith—Knox.
[3] Spottiswood, Keith—Knox.

a native of Ayr, who were likewise accused of heresy. Archbishop Dunbar, of Glasgow, was suspected of backwardness in prosecuting. A commission, consisting of John Lauder, official of Lothian, Andrew Oliphant, and a friar of the name of Maltman, were therefore despatched to assist at the trial as assessors; for the archbishop had said in open court that he disapproved of these cruel persecutions, which were much more likely to advance the cause, he said, than to extirpate the heresy. But his merciful disposition was overruled by the assessors, and these innocent men were condemned to be burnt alive. Kennedy and Russell were bound to one stake; and while the fire was preparing, the latter comforted his youthful fellow-sufferer, who shewed some symptoms of natural fear in the hour of trial: "Fear not, brother," said he; "for He is more mighty *that is in us*, than he that *is in the world*. The pain which we shall suffer is short and light; but our joy and consolation shall never have an end. Death cannot destroy us, for it is already destroyed by Him for whose sake we suffer. Therefore let us strive to enter in by the same strait way which our Saviour hath taken before us." Having commended their souls to God, the fire was kindled, and they were added to the noble army of martyrs[1].

The persecution was now so hot that many on whom the spirit of martyrdom had not fallen fled into England, then the common sanctuary of the afflicted, to escape the *fiery* trial to which they would have been subjected for their alleged heresy. Among the refugees was the celebrated GEORGE BUCHANAN, who made a narrow escape from the honour of martyrdom, for having written some sarcastic verses on the immoral lives of the Franciscans: he was committed to prison in the Sea Tower of St Andrews, but made his escape by a window, and fled into France. Archbishop James Beaton had long committed the whole ecclesiastical affairs of the kingdom to his nephew Cardinal Beaton, a man of extraordinary talents, who had been elevated to this dignity by Pope Paul III., and who had acquired a complete ascendancy over the mind of the king, and, in fact, he exercised the whole powers of the primacy. Buchanan had made himself peculiarly odious to the whole body of the clergy on account of more than one poetical satire upon their lewd and immoral lives, and he would unquestionably have suffered at the stake had he not made his escape.[2] Balfour says, "This year

[1] Keith, Spottiswood—Knox.
[2] Lawson's Life of Buchanan, Knox's Hist.

also a canon regular, two Dominican friars, and three commoners, were burnt at Edinburgh for profession of the gospel; and this year also the king gives George Durrey the abbey of Dunfermline. This year the queen was delivered of a son, who was baptised James[1].

In the latter end of this year Archbishop James Beaton died, in the thirty-first year of his consecration, and was interred with great pomp in the Cathedral of St. Andrews. He sat fourteen years archbishop of Glasgow, and seventeen years in St. Andrews; and he was besides lord chancellor of the kingdom. He seems to have been a good easy sort of man, and was not disposed to have been a persecutor; but having long committed the government of the church to his nephew the Cardinal, the atrocities of his primacy were committed in his name, but not by his authority. He recommended the Cardinal, who had been his coadjutor since his return from France, to be his successor, and which the king confirmed out of respect to his memory and for the injuries which the old archbishop had sustained from the faction of the Douglases during the king's minority. His most reverend and most worthy successor has happily drawn his character as one rather lukewarm than zealous in repressing the reformers: "Seventeen years he lived bishop of this See, and was herein most unfortunate, that under the shadow of his authority many good men were put to death for the cause of religion, though he himself was neither violently set, *nor much solicitous*, as it was thought, *how matters went in the church*[2]."

In the prosecutions which have been already mentioned, it is curious to observe that the burning article of the Romish Church, namely, *transubstantiation*, has seldom or ever been charged against those who suffered for conscience sake. The chief charge against them seems to have been adherence to the doctrinal reformation of the Church of England under the illustrious Cranmer, and it has been seen that the first impulse of the reformation came from England. The entire dissolution of morals among the clergy of all ranks, both secular and regular, furnished a never ceasing and most popular subject of declamation to those to whom God had given the grace of greater purity of heart and correctness of manners. It is true that Knox's virulent declamatory accusations must be taken with caution; yet the living monuments

[1] Balfour's Annals of Scotland, I. 270, 271. Spottiswood.—Keith's History, 9-10.

of their guilt, the *illegitimate* sons and daughters of churchmen, who figured in history, form a sufficient evidence of their adulterous lives, and of the utter prostration of female chastity which the licentious and unbridled lust of an unmarried priesthood had accomplished. The effects of these "seducing spirits," that is, of those wicked men who, pretending to act by the Divine Spirit, had imposed that "doctrine of devils" on the whole western church—"*forbidding to marry*"—were more conspicuous and deleterious in Scotland than in any other portion of Christendom. Even the external appearance of decorum and decency was wanting in the wealthier monasteries and nunneries, whose inmates exhibited to the world the most scandalous examples of luxury, ignorance of religious duties, licentiousness, and immorality. Their wealth tempted the cupidity of all ranks, and their wide-spreading domains excited the envy and the avarice of the aristocracy. No doubt there were good men amongst them who saw and lamented the immoralities of their brethren, as the dying speech of Russell, replete with Catholic doctrine, amply attests; but the mass of the conventual orders of both sexes who were the victims of that doctrine of devils, were sunk in the most imbrutalized debauchery and lost to all sense of shame at that period.

CHAPTER II.

PRIMACY OF ARCHBISHOP DAVID BEATON, CARDINAL, LEGATUS NATUS, AND LEGATE A LATERE.

The succession of Cardinal Beaton.—Sir John Borthwick—Condemned—Burnt in effigy.—Acts of parliament.—King James V.—Opinions.—Henry VIII.—Defender of the Faith—Head of the Church.—Mission of the Bishop of St. David's.—Conference proposed between the kings of England and Scotland.—The Pope courts James—Second interview proposed—Artifices of the clergy to prevent it—King's speech to the clergy.—The king breaks faith with Henry.—Sir James Hamilton made Inquisitor General.—Death of James V.—Birth of Queen Mary.—Cardinal produces a surreptitious will—King's will proclaimed.—Earl of Arran proclaimed regent—Favourable to the Reformation—His chaplains.—Scottish nobles at the court of Henry VIII.—Proposals for a marriage betwixt the Prince of Wales and the Queen.—Parliament.—The Cardinal imprisoned.—Kingdom laid under an Interdict.—Marriage treaty signed.—The clergy contribute towards the expense of a war.—Change in the Regent's politics—Renounces the Reformation, and is publicly absolved—Effects of this change.—Arran's legitimacy called in question.—Act authorising a translation of the Scriptures.—Patriarch of Venice.—Act for reading the Bible repealed—The Regent's threat.—The Cardinal's progress.—Executions at Perth—Provincial council—George Wishart—The Cardinal's proceedings—Wishart tried—Condemned—Burnt alive—Not entitled to the honour of martyrdom.—Marriage of the Cardinal's daughter—Conspiracy against his life—His murder—Character.—Concluding reflections.

1540.—Archbishop David Beaton was the second subject of the crown of Scotland that had held the papal rank of legate; Ralph Wardlaw, who sat bishop of Glasgow from 1368 to 1389, being the only other prelate who had ever enjoyed this unecclesiastical rank, to which Beaton was elevated in December, 1538, by the title of *the Cardinal of St. Stephen in Monte Calio*: and which conferred on him absolute power in the church. Beaton was firmly attached to the papal interest; and the pope could not have bestowed his titles on one more worthy of the honour, or one better fitted from his talents and inclination to preserve the papal power and influence in Scotland.

At this period, the reformers carved out abundance of work for the ecclesiastical courts,—few days passed without some commitments and prosecutions for heresy; but the hotter and more violent the persecution, the greater was the increase of the converts. Immediately on his translation,

the cardinal assembled a splendid company of the nobility and churchmen at St. Andrews; to which place he had at the same time cited Sir John Borthwick. Being seated in the cathedral on a throne or elevated chair of state in his right as a Cardinal, and surrounded by the most illustrious of the nobility and prelates, he expatiated on the dangerous tendency of the new doctrines to the Catholic faith, and the necessity of their suppression, and concluded by desiring their assistance on the trial. The indictment contained all the usual charges; but in particular, that Sir John had dispersed heretical books, and maintained that "the *Church of Scotland ought to be governed after the manner of the Church of England*," and that "*the English liturgy was commendable*, and ought to be embraced by all Christians." It is worthy of remark, that all our early reformers held Episcopacy as a fundamental principle, and never had any intention of throwing off the Episcopal government; the clearest proof of which is, that Sir John Borthwick was arraigned on an accusation of heresy, in which his declared attachment to the *doctrines*, *discipline*, and *liturgy* of the Reformed Episcopal Church of England, constituted two distinct charges. Sir John fled to England, then the common sanctuary of the Scottish Protestants, and thereby preserved his head. He was called in court, but not appearing, the charges against him (thirteen in number) were held as confessed. He was condemned on the 28th May to be burnt as a heretic; his goods were confiscated, his *effigy was burnt* in the market-place of St. Andrews, and all men were inhibited from harbouring or protecting him, on pain of *damnation*, and forfeiture of their effects. Sir John was graciously received by Henry VIII. and sent by him on a mission to the Protestant princes of Germany, to concert a confederacy between them, in defence of their common profession [1].

1541.—In a parliament held in the beginning of this year several acts for the suppression of heresy were made chiefly through the influence of the Cardinal, and which were so framed as to give churchmen the most summary power. The king, however, was himself exceedingly anxious for the clergy to reform their own lives and morals, and he procured an act to be passed for that purpose on the 14th March, 1541, entituled, "for *reforming* kirks and kirkmen," as follows:—"Because the *negligence of divine service*, the *great unhonesty* in the kirk through not making of reparation to the honour

[1] Spottis.—Knox, Keith.

of God Almighty, and to the blessed sacrament of the Altar, the Virgin Mary, and to all holy saints; and also the *unhonesty and* MISRULE *of kirkmen, both in wit, knowledge, and manners*, is the *matter* and *cause* that the kirk and kirkmen are lightlied and contemned: for remeid hereof the king's grace exhorts and prays openly, all archbishops, bishops, ordinaries, and other prelates, and every kirkman in his own degree, to *reform themselves*, &c. *in habit and manners* to God and man; and that you cause in every kirk within your diocese . . . . . reparations and reparating to be honestly and substantially made and done to the honour of God Almighty, the blessed sacraments, and divine service, every kirk after the quality and quantity of the rents: And if any person allege some eremit (excuse) and will not obey nor obtemper to the superior, in that behalf the king's grace shall find remeid therefor, at the pope's holiness and ricklike against the said prelates if they be negligent[1]."

The act above cited decidedly shews the demoralized state of the dignitaries of the church, "both in wit, knowledge, and manners." And although the inferior clergy were equally wicked in life and manners, yet it was chiefly from among their order that the great majority of the converts to the reformed doctrines appear to have proceeded. It is painful, however, to see how far many of their opinions were at variance with catholic truth, and were the mere emanations of an ill-regulated private judgment, taken up merely in a spirit of opposition to the corruptions of the church, from which they had seceded. The king was anxious for a reformation of the manners of the prelates; but he had no desire to overturn the discipline or the doctrines of the church. He took care that an act should pass, commanding the church "to pray to the Virgin Mary to intercede for a happy and prosperous life to the king," and which contained "a severe prohibition, not to cast down, nor treat irreverently, the images of the holy saints." By these acts it will appear, says Bishop Keith, "that the king had no mind to introduce such a sort of reformation as his uncle had done in England, which is likewise abundantly evident from his own conference with Sir Ralph Sadler on that head. But if he had lived for some time, I make as little doubt but he would have taken care to cause the abuses to be reformed, which had too much overspread the worship and practice of the church. That, I think, may be gathered from his own expressions with the fore-

[1] Cited in Keith's Hist. p. 14.

mentioned gentleman, and from what we have already heard that our historians have related concerning him; but especially from that act of parliament concerning the reforming of kirks and kirkmen [1]."

Before Henry VIII. relieved the crown of England from its intolerable bondage and slavery to the see of Rome, "whereat," says Balfour, "king James somewhat grimiles," he wrote a book in favour of the pope's usurpation, which so pleased the ambitious pontiff, that he conferred on Henry the title of *Defender of the Faith*, and which his successors continue to assume. The clergy of England, when the whole kingdom was incontestibly in communion with the see of Rome, met in full convocation, and recognised and acknowledged Henry to be the "*Sole Protector and Supreme* HEAD *of the Church* of England." Elizabeth resigned this title as to *spirituals*, but retained it in the *temporal* concerns of the church. The subject of the king's supremacy in the church has been much misrepresented; and it is alleged by her enemies, as a crime of the deepest dye, that she yields to the sovereign "that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in holy scripture, by God himself: that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers." By this article, the church confines the king's *headship* to things temporal. The Jewish princes *were made the* HEADS *of the tribes of Israel* [2] by God's special appointment, and the first Christian emperors always without challenge exercised temporal supremacy, till the usurpation of the popes deprived kings of their just rights of sovereignty over the ecclesiastical estate, and withdrew it entirely from the royal jurisdiction; so that a priest could not be tried for any crime by the common law of the kingdom, but by the ecclesiastical law, which was entirely independent of the king. For the first three centuries, the civil power either persecuted or neglected the church, and therefore she was under the necessity of managing her own affairs without them; but as soon as the emperors became her nursing-fathers, her *temporal* affairs depended on them, as her supreme civil governors and protectors. God himself arms all princes with the sword [3]: but in vain would they bear that instrument, if the ecclesiastical estate were ex-

[1] Keith's Hist. p. 15. [2] 1 Sam. xv. 17.
[3] Rom. xiii. 1—8.

empted from their authority; and which is the case wherever the Church of Rome is dominant. Whatever disputes about words may have arisen, and however resolutely Presbyterians may disclaim the supremacy of the crown, yet, in fact, they daily submit to it. Our present sovereign, Queen Victoria, is as much the *head* of the Presbyterian establishment as she is acknowledged to be of the church in England: that is, in short, she is the supreme *civil* governor, for in no other capacity can she be the head of the church.

In the year 1535, Henry VIII. sent the bishop of St. David's on a special mission to his nephew King James, to treat with him about the reformation of the Church of Scotland, and at the same time sent some books on the subject. He earnestly desired a conference at York, offered him his daughter the Lady Mary in marriage, with the title of Duke of York, and Lieutenant of the whole kingdom, and eventually the succession to the crown of England. This alarmed the Romish clergy, and they immediately dissuaded the king from reading the books, or accepting the invitation for a conference, telling him it would ruin religion, his own soul, his state, and kingdom; and they represented the risk he might run in being detained prisoner as James I. had been. It is supposed that Henry's offer had made some impression on his nephew James, and Keith cites a despatch of the latter to Henry, dated May, 1536, in which the king says, "that he had sent to Rome to get impetrations for reformation of some enormities, especially anent the ordering of the great and many possessions and temporal lands given to the kirk by our noble predecessors.'

The pope himself condescended to court James; and to confirm him in the faith, lest he should follow his uncle's example, he sent legates into Scotland to counteract the strong English influence which, since the family alliance, had existed in the kingdom, and conferred on him the tenth of all the ecclesiastical benefices for three years. In the year 1540, Henry again insisted the second time for an interview, and named York as the place of meeting. This plunged the clergy into the utmost consternation, and they exerted every artifice to avert so dangerous an interview. They foresaw the downfal of their church, if the uncle and nephew should meet, as Henry's principal object was to extend the reformation of the church to the kingdom of Scotland. As a last resource, they tempted the king's avarice and poverty, and promised him large sums of money,—a convincing proof of their fears and anxiety to prevent the interview of the royal

relatives. Knox says, they taxed themselves in no less a sum than 50,000 crowns from their benefices yearly, and a levy of men from the church lands which were exempt from military service; besides they still further tempted his cupidity by the prospect of the immense sums that might arise from the confiscated estates of heretics. They presented to his majesty a paper, in which was contained the names of about 360 noblemen, gentlemen, and others, who were suspected of heresy, and with whose estates they suggested he might enrich himself[1].

It is said, Kircaldy of Grange the Lord Treasurer, had the merit of having dissuaded his majesty from following this advice. Being dissatisfied with the prelates for having divided him from his nobility, he summoned some of them into his presence, and thus addressed them:—"Packe you!—get you to your charges, and reform your own lives, and be not instruments of discord betwixt my nobility and me, or else I vow I shall reform you; not as the king of Denmark doth,—by imprisonment, neither yet as the king of England doth,—by heading and hanging: but I shall reform you by sharp punishments, if ever I hear such motion again;" adding, "I will stick you with this whinger,"—drawing his dagger: when they left his presence in fear[2].

1542.—James, however, unhappily listened to these interested advisers, and broke his promise to meet his uncle at York, which incensed king Henry, and a war was the consequence. After this, James gave himself entirely up to the counsels and advice of Cardinal Beaton, and even countenanced the persecution of the Protestants. He gave Sir James Hamilton a commission as Inquisitor-General of the kingdom, with power to summon all persons suspected of heresy, and to inflict the punishments due to that crime. The king was now become so zealous in the cause of Rome, that he was heard to say—"that none of all that sort might expect favour at his hands; nay, not even his own sons, should they prove guilty[3]." Unhappily, his two sons, James and Arthur, did not survive, to put his zeal to the test, for they both died in one night of malignant fever,—one at Stirling, and the other at St. Andrews; and the king, being overwhelmed with grief and passion for the defeat of his army at Solway-Moss, died at Falkland, in the thirty-second year of his age, leaving an infant daughter, the unfortunate and much abused MARY STUART, as his successor. "For grief of this

[1] Knox—Spottiswood—Keith.
[2] Keith. [3] Spottiswood.

loss (the defeat of his army at Solway), and disgrace put upon him by his proud and factious nobility, the king sickens of a Lent fever, at Falkland: the queen, in the meantime, is brought to bed of a daughter, christened MARY. News whereof being brought to the king, he turns himself to the wall, and with a grievous groan, says, 'Scotland did come with a lass, and it will go with one,—*devil go with it:*' and so, without any more words to a purpose, departs this life, at his Palace of Falkland, the 19th of the kalends of January, in the 31st year of his age and 30th of his reign, in the year of our redemption 1542. His body being embalmed and put in a coffin of lead, was solemnly interred in the burial of the king, in the Abbey Church of the Holy Cross, near Edinburgh[1]."

It has been attempted by Knox to fix the stain of assassination on Cardinal Beaton, by alleging that the premature death of James V. was occasioned by poison administered to him by that ecclesiastic. But this is every way improbable, inasmuch as the king was, next after himself, the chief support of the Romish hierarchy, and whose death would, and did, very seriously affect its stability. It was decidedly contrary to his own and his church's welfare to remove the king at this critical juncture of their affairs, whose authority was so essentially necessary for the support of the tottering fabric of the church, and when a long minority would enable the nobles to act as independent plunderers of the church's property. Immediately after the demise of the king, the cardinal produced a will which he had caused the king to sign a short time before his death. It is said, that after the king became insensible, the cardinal took "the king's hand into his, and so leading it along, caused him to subscribe a blank paper, wherein afterwards he himself was appointed tutor to the young queen and governor of the realm; and three of the principal nobility were assigned him as councillors or assessors in the administration,—viz. the Earls of Huntly, Argyle, and Arran[2]."

The cardinal caused this forged will to be proclaimed with due formality at the Cross and other places of Edinburgh; but the nobility began to suspect, if it was not an absolute forgery, yet that the cardinal had at least used undue methods to procure his own elevation. The principal nobility, therefore, with the friends and relations of the Earl of Arran, who was nearest in blood to the crown, proclaimed that nobleman, on

[1] Balfour's Annals, i. 275. [2] Keith's Hist. 25.—Knox.

the 22d of December, Regent of the kingdom and Tutor of the Queen. This, however, was not effected without a powerful opposition from the cardinal and those who were attached to the French party and to the Roman church[1].

After the infant queen, the regent Arran was the next heir to the crown, and he was generally supported by the Protestant nobility and gentry; besides he himself was well disposed towards the reformation of religion. His elevation, therefore, gave universal satisfaction to the Protestants, as he was a man of a mild conciliatory disposition; and he so far favoured the Reformation, that he maintained in his family two chaplains, Williams and Rough. The first had been formerly Provincial of the Dominicans in Scotland, and he had translated the New Testament into the vulgar tongue[2]: the latter was also a Dominican. Both these chaplains were in priest's orders, had deserted the Roman communion, and they both, afterwards, held livings in the Protestant Church of England. They preached publicly at court, and declaimed boldly against the Roman corruptions, being openly countenanced by the regent, and encouraged by those noblemen who, having been taken prisoners at the disgraceful affair of Solway-Moss, had imbibed the reformed doctrines, and who had been carefully instructed therein at the Court of England. These circumstances had a favourable tendency towards a regular reformation of the Church of Scotland, without destroying its foundation; for, notwithstanding its many gross errors and corruptions, the Church of Rome has maintained inviolate the episcopal succession, without breach or controversy, which is the divine charter of the Gospel priesthood in the New Testament, as it was for the Aaronical under the Old; for although there have been repeatedly popes and antipopes, yet the succession has not been invalidated; because the popes have always been true bishops, which is all that we are concerned with. It had been happy for the peace of these kingdoms, if the Scottish hierarchy had themselves reformed their native church, and preserved it from the desecrating hands of the "rascal multitude" in the first instance, and from the more disastrous "inclinations of the people" in the second, which has produced a chaos of anarchy and confusion such as has never been seen in any Christian church, from the days of the apostles downwards.

The noble prisoners who were taken at the disgraceful flight of Solway-Moss were carried to London, and lodged in

[1] Keith, 25.—Knox, 36.

[2] Balfour's Annals, i. 277.

the Tower; but Henry afterwards liberated them on parole, and they were sent to the house of Archbishop Cranmer and other bishops, and to some of the nobility, where uncommon pains had been taken, during their brief stay in England, by Archbishop Cranmer and the other parties with whom they abode, to teach them the reformed doctrines. They had the benefit likewise of perusing the Holy Scriptures, which had been translated by Tindal in 1526, a new and improved edition of which had been published in 1540, under the auspices of Archbishop Cranmer. On their return these noblemen eagerly pressed Queen Mary's first parliament to grant the same privilege to her subjects in Scotland. Burnet says, that "Cassilis had got these seeds of knowledge at Lambeth under Cranmer's influence, which produced afterwards a great harvest in Scotland. That the other prisoners (eight noblemen and twenty-four gentlemen) were instructed to such a degree, that they came to have very different thoughts of the changes that had been made in England, from what the Scottish clergy had possessed them with; who had encouraged their king to engage in the war, by the assurance of victory, since he fought against an heretical prince."

As soon as Henry heard of his nephew's death, and that he had left an heiress only seven days old, he conceived the idea of uniting the kingdoms by a marriage betwixt his son Prince Edward and Mary Stuart, the infant Queen of the Scots. On the 26th of December, Henry entertained all his prisoners, and broke to them his newly-formed project, and entreated their concurrence, to which some of them cordially assented, and bound themselves to bring about the marriage, and to send the young Queen into England to be educated. Henry relaxed his usual despotic hauteur, and condescended to court his prisoners by the most adroit flattery; and he succeeded in completely attaching them to his interest. Mr. Sadler affirms, that Henry bestowed pensions on them, and engaged them to deliver hostages to him for their return in the event of their not succeeding in their design. Accordingly he sent them all home on the 1st of January, 1543, and on their road they dined with the Prince of Wales at Enfield. He also sent home his brother-in-law, the Earl of Angus, and his brother Sir George Douglas, who had been exiles in England for fourteen years, with letters to the regent, requesting a restitution of their lands and honours.[1] Indeed, the English

[1] Keith's History, 26.

influence in Scotland was now so strong, that the French or Roman Catholic was quite overpowered.

1543.—These noblemen arrived in Edinburgh about the middle of January, having delivered their pledges to the Duke of Suffolk at Newcastle. They communicated Henry's proposal to the regent, who entered heartily into it, and summoned a great council to deliberate on the best mode of proceeding, which resulted in the summoning of a parliament, to meet at Edinburgh on the 11th of March. It was expected that the cardinal and the French party would offer a vigorous resistance to the marriage of the Queen and the alliance with England; and, in consequence, the council determined on the arbitrary and illegal step of arresting and committing him to the state prison of Blackness Castle. For this unjust and daring act the only excuse which could be advanced was a fabricated report of his having invited the Duke of Guise, with a French army, into the kingdom, to subdue it. The regent confessed to Sadler that this report was a mere pretence to get him out of the way, from whose talents, vigour, and immense influence, the English party had so much to fear. This imprudent step alarmed the whole body of the clergy throughout the realm. They identified his case with their own, and became more united than before among themselves, and simultaneously entered into a concert to lay the whole kingdom under an INTERDICT—a step resorted to by the Pope only upon the most urgent occasions, and when his authority was disputed. Mr. Tytler says,[1] "the public services of religion were instantly suspended, the priests refused to administer the sacraments of baptism, the churches were closed, an universal gloom overspread the countenances of the people, and the country presented the melancholy appearance of a land excommunicated for some awful crime. The days, indeed, were past when the full terrors of such a state of spiritual proscription could be felt; yet the Catholic party were still strong in Scotland; they loudly exclaimed against their opponents for so daring an act of sacrilege and injustice; and the people began, in some degree, to identify the cause of Beaton with the independence of the country."

The business of parliament commenced on the 13th of March, when the Earl of Arran was declared to be the nearest in succession to the throne, failing the Queen, and he was recognised as regent of the kingdom. The Archbishop of Glasgow, then chancellor, opposed the marriage of the

[1] Tytler's History of Scotland, v. p. 318.

Queen to the Prince of Wales; but it was agreed to nevertheless; the time of the Queen's being sent into England only having been left undecided. On the 25th of August this treaty was ratified, signed, and solemnly sworn, at high mass, in the Abbey Church of Holyrood House, and the Great Seal of the kingdom appended thereto. Although the English influence in this parliament was predominant, yet the French or Romish interest was too powerful to be disregarded with safety; and the committal of the Cardinal roused their sympathies in his favour who was its main support. The Earl of Argyle retired to his own country, threatening to raise his clan for his rescue; and the earls of Huntly, Bothwell, and Moray, demanded his release, and offered themselves as hostages for his submission to the regent and decrees of parliament.[1]

The regent seems at this time to have been generally much respected, and cheerfully obeyed, and the whole government went on smoothly under English influence. But this happy state of things was not to continue; for no sooner had parliament concluded the match with England, than the cardinal was set at liberty by the queen-dowager's advice, who, as Bishop Sage says, was "all over French and Papist." His first object was to recover the French, and, by consequence, the Roman interest; in order to effect which he assembled the whole clergy, represented to them the danger to the Roman church by the marriage of the queen to an heretical prince, and the consequent ascendancy of the English influence in the kingdom, unless the solid engagements entered into between the governments were broken. He obliged them to tax themselves, therefore, to raise a large sum of money to bribe such of the nobility as were not proof against its charms. It was also determined at that meeting to preach from the pulpits against the match and alliance with England, —to excite popular tumults and disturbances,—and to take all opportunities of insulting the English ambassador. The cardinal's authority and energetic appeal to the clergy made them contribute liberally towards the revenue in the event of a war, which his sagacity foresaw would ensue if the treaty were broken with Henry. They contributed money, private plate, and even the sacred utensils belonging to the churches.

As soon as the cardinal had regained his liberty he made overtures of reconciliation to the regent, and wrought on his fears, by instigating John Hamilton, abbot of Paisley, his

[1] Keith.—Tytler.—Spottiswood.—Knox.—Balfour's Annals, i. 277-9.

natural brother, to represent to him, that if he should fulfil this matrimonial alliance, he would thereby undoubtedly establish the Reformation; and if he did so, that his own legitimacy might be called in question, unless he kept the Pope on his side, which he could only do by preserving the Roman Catholic ascendancy, and crushing the Reformation in the bud. His father's marriage with his first wife, *who was still living*, had been set aside, without sufficient cause, *by the Pope's apostolical authority alone:* if, therefore, the laws of the Church, as then established, were abrogated, his mother's marriage would become null and void, his own right to the earldom, and, eventually, his title to the throne, would be forfeited. Besides, Keith shows, that as soon as Henry had gained the object of his ambition, he treated the regent with contempt, and denied him the title of Governor, styling him Earl of Arran *occupying the place of governor.* He likewise saw that Henry had no mind to confer the hand of his daughter (the Princess Elizabeth) on his son, as he had previously proposed; so that, altogether, Arran began to repent of his English alliance, and sincerely to desire an accommodation with the cardinal.[1] He therefore broke faith with Henry, as a token of which he had taken the sacrament as a pledge of his sincerity, stole quietly to Stirling, renounced the Protestant religion, and was reconciled to the Church of Rome, and publicly received absolution from the hands of Cardinal Beaton in the Franciscan church. After this the cardinal assumed the whole power, and left the regent only the name. The cardinal had previously conducted the queen mother, with her infant daughter, to Stirling, where he threatened the regent with deposition, *by authority of the Pope,* "as inobedient to holy Mother Church;" and to make assurance doubly sure, he demanded, and obtained, the regent's eldest son as a hostage, under colour of superintending his education, but, in reality, to secure his father's fidelity. His return to the established religion mortified and disgusted the Reformers, and the consequence of his apostacy immediately appeared in the dismissal of his two Protestant chaplains, Williams and Rough, and such other gentlemen of his household as favoured the Reformation. Sir Robert Richardson, a reformed priest, and others, who had been sent down by Henry VIII., and had been well received, were now glad to return home, being, says Keith, in danger of their lives, since the regent's change.

[1] Keith.

Henry seeing that the regent, the cardinal, and also his own pensioners, had become lukewarm in the matrimonial alliance on which he himself was firmly bent, now resorted to other measures. He therefore instigated Matthew, earl of Lennox, to return into Scotland from France, betwixt whom and the regent there was a fatal feud, on account of the slaughter of his father, the earl of Arran, when lord Hamilton. His pretensions to the crown were good, if the divorce alluded to above was declared illegal. Matthew, earl of Lennox, married the daughter of lord Hamilton, by his wife the princess Mary, daughter of James II., by whom he had a son, John, who was slain as aforesaid, and who was the father of the present Matthew, earl of Lennox. He alleged that the regent was a bastard, because James, earl of Arran, who was also descended of the Princess Mary, had divorced his first wife, the lady Elizabeth Home, without just cause, simply on the *Pope's authority:* and had, during her lifetime, married the regent's mother. He therefore laid claim to the rights and inheritances of the family of Arran, as being descended from a daughter of the princess Mary. Henry also held out the lure to this nobleman of the hope of succeeding to the crown, and of marrying the queen dowager. Further, he embargoed all the Scottish vessels in the harbours of England, and confiscated their cargoes—a step which greatly alienated the Scotch from the English alliance.[1]

Henry frequently urged the regent *to reform*, that is, to *plunder* the church, and to extirpate the religious orders. In his reply, says bishop Keith, the regent *hit the right nail upon the head;* for he said to Sadler, "That though he desired no less the reformation of the abuses of the church, and the extirpation of the estate of monks and friars, with the abolition of the bishop of Rome's usurped authority, than that king (Henry) did; yet he owned that that would be a hard matter to bring to pass, for there be so many great men in the kingdom that are Papists, that unless *the sin of covetousness* bring them into it (that is, the desire of having the lands of the Abbeys in their own possession), he knew no other means to win them to his purpose in that behalf."

1544.—In this first parliament of Queen Mary, the Protestant interest was so strong that an act was passed, on a petition by the Lord Maxwell, "*that it should be lawful for all our Sovereign Lady's lieges to have the holy writ of the Old and New Testaments in the vulgar tongue, of a good and true*

[1] Keith.—Knox.

translation, without incurring any crime for hearing or reading the same." On the first reading of this act, Gavin Dunbar, Archbishop of Glasgow, and Lord High Chancellor of the kingdom, in his own name, and in that of the bishops (who are the *first* of the three estates of the kingdom), opposed it, and protested against the passing of any act that might empower the laity to possess and read the holy scriptures, "until a provincial council could be held of all the clergy, to advise and conclude if the same be necessary to be had among the queen's lieges." But the Protestant interest was too powerful. The knowledge which the noble captives had gained in England had opened their eyes to the blessings of the holy scriptures; and their arguments and influence completely overpowered the party still attached to the Church of Rome. The bill passed, and was proclaimed at the market-cross with due formalities by the regent's order; and thus was that inestimable blessing conferred on the laity, when the Romish church was still in its strength and vigour. This was the severest blow which the Church of Rome had yet received, as heretofore the sacred books had been shut up in the dead languages, and were inaccessible to the laity generally. Previous to this act of parliament, no man dared to read the Lord's Prayer, the ten commandments, nor the articles of the faith, in the vulgar tongue, without incurring the pains and penalties of heresy[1]. This act was especially ordered to be proclaimed with every formality, at Edinburgh, on the 19th of March. It was violently but ineffectually opposed by the Romish clergy; but afterwards, a great number of copies of Cranmer's Bible were sent from England, as well as many other books of divinity.

The patriarch of Venice had been sent into Scotland a short time before, as legate from the pope, and was received by the regent with all the honours to which so distinguished an ambassador was entitled. He persuaded the regent and the queen mother, as they tendered the welfare of the Roman religion and his holiness's blessing, not to fulfil the matrimonial engagement with England, which had been lately concluded. At his departure, he transferred his legantine power *à latere* to Cardinal Beaton; and on his return to Rome, "informed the pope and the college of cardinals of the singular good will and humanity of the Scots, as also of their affection to the Roman church[2]."

1545.—This year Robert Cairncross, Bishop of Ross,

[1] Keith's Hist.—Knox. [2] Balfour's Annals, i. 284.

died, and was succeeded by David Panter, secretary to the regent. In April, William Stewart, Bishop of Aberdeen, died, and was succeeded in that see by William Gordon, chanter of Moray, and uncle to George, Earl of Huntly[1].

The regent's apostacy surprised and confounded the Protestants, and rendered both their persons and property insecure. In consequence, Thomas Williams and John Rough, his chaplains, fled to England, being apprehensive of personal danger. The fears of the Protestants were still more increased, by the regent's declaring in parliament his determination to punish *heretics*, and root out their *damnable opinions*, in order to shew his zeal in his late conversion,—"exhorting all prelates and ordinaries, each within his own diocese and jurisdiction, to inquire upon all manner of such persons, and proceed against them according to the laws of holy church; and my lord governor shall be at all times ready to do therein what accords him of his office." The act of parliament which allowed the translation and reading of the holy scriptures was repealed by the regent's authority; and those who either read or possessed a copy of the Bible in the vernacular tongue were to suffer condign punishment[2].

Cardinal Beaton had now obtained the direction of the regent, and possessed as much the supreme power, without its responsibility, as if the supposititious will of the late king had been valid, and he had been, in fact, the regent. In the beginning of this year he made a visitation of his diocese with more than royal magnificence. He was escorted by the regent and a number of the nobility; and on their arrival at Perth he took up his abode in the Charterhouse. Here a multitude were presented at the bar of his court, accused of heresy and of reading and disputing on the holy scriptures. Some were banished and others were imprisoned; but William Anderson, Robert Lamb, James Ronald, James Hunter, and James Findlayson, were condemned to be hanged; and Helen Stark (the wife of the latter), to be drowned. Great exertions were made to save the sufferers, but to no purpose: for the men had nailed the horns of a ram to the head of an image of St. Francis, and broken the popish rules respecting Lent; and the woman perished in consequence of having refused, while in labour, to invoke the Virgin Mary, and firmly declaring she would address her prayers to God only, through the mediation of her Lord and Saviour. Having commended her soul to the arms of her Saviour, and her sucking baby to the charity of her

[1] Balfour's Annals, i. 284. [2] Keith.

neighbours, she was bound, cast into the deep water, and entered into the joy of her Lord. Many others, some even of rank, were banished, imprisoned, and their property was confiscated. Sir Henry Elder, John Elder, Walter Piper, and Laurence Puller, with some of the burgesses of Perth, were banished; and the Lord Ruthven, its Provost, was degraded from his office, being suspected of favouring the Protestants. Spottiswood asserts, "that the ignorance of these times was so great, as even the priests did think the New Testament was composed by Martin Luther, and the Old to be the only scripture that men ought to read[1]."

The cardinal continued his progress through the counties of Angus and Mearns, still leading the weak regent in his train, and holding similar inquisitions wherever he went, with similar results as at Perth. About the same time, John Roger, a priest, who had professed the reformed religion, and who is represented by Knox to have been "a godly and learned man," fell among the rocks and was killed, in attempting to escape from the sea-tower at St. Andrews, where he had been committed with the view, doubtless, of his being made an example, to deter others[2].

1546.—These cruel proceedings against the Protestants had the effect of increasing their numbers. The immoral and licentious lives of the Romish clergy formed an ever ready subject of declamation for the reformed preachers, and a plausible excuse for the laity to desert their former blind guides. For the purpose, therefore, of stopping the alarming increase of heresy, and of reforming the private lives of the Romish clergy, the cardinal summoned a provincial council, or general assembly, to meet at Edinburgh in January of this year. There is no other record of the business before this synod extant, farther than of its opening; and that the cardinal, as its president or moderator, recommended the bishops and the other members to proceed vigorously against all within their jurisdiction who should be accused of heresy. He, however, exhorted them to reform themselves, as patterns to others, by living godly and prudent lives, whereby they would deprive the reformers of one principal part of their invectives, and of their excuse for reformation. This advice seems to have been most extensively necessary, inasmuch as the whole body of the clergy were universally addicted to the *works of the flesh*, and the kingdom swarmed with their illegitimate issue.

The desire for reformation had hitherto been chiefly con-

[1] Spottiswood.—Knox.—Keith. [2] Spottiswood.—Knox.

fined to the inferior orders of the clergy; and as yet the sins of covetousness and sacrilege had not awakened the reforming piety of the nobility, the majority of whom were still attached to the ancient hierarchy. Among the inferior laity, the reformed doctrines had made the most considerable progress in the seaports and towns of the chief resort of strangers. Hitherto, says a modern writer, "whatsoever may have been the cause of alarm on the part of the church, it is certain that the Protestant faith had been principally confined to some local districts in the two archi-episcopal dioceses of St. Andrews and Glasgow. In none of the other dioceses was there a single prosecution; and no instance is known of the bishops proceeding, or having cause to proceed, against any individual within their own jurisdiction. North of the Tay, with the exception of the Dominican friar, Rogers, whom the cardinal captured during his visitation, and the town of Dundee, there was no disposition towards change; and south of that river the cases had principally occurred in the large towns where foreigners congregated, such as Edinburgh, Glasgow, Stirling, Perth, and St. Andrews; in all of which places facilities were easily afforded by constant intercourse for the dissemination of the Protestant doctrines. Of the few nobility and influential men who were favourable to the Protestants, hardly one of them at this period *understood the Protestant faith*; and they supported or favoured it merely to suit their own political views, from private jealousies and quarrels, which ceased as soon as a reconciliation was effected among them. It is in this way that we must account for the manner in which the prosecutions for religion were viewed; and, although they made a serious impression on those who witnessed them, were conducted at intervals for nearly thirty years from the executive of Patrick Hamilton, without exciting any dangerous clamour[1]."

Whilst cardinal Beaton was engaged in opening this synod, he received information that George Wishart, for whom he had been long anxiously searching, was at that time concealed in Ormiston house, in East Lothian. "Master George" was a layman of respectable connexions, had been educated at Cambridge, was a man of considerable eloquence, and of an agreeable manner of communication. After his return to Scotland, he taught a school at Montrose, and was universally respected for his learning and great piety. Although without being in orders, and only a mere layman, he preached very

[1] Lawson's Roman Cath. Church in Scotland, 111, 112.

successfully the reformed doctrines; but Beaton's energetic measures compelled him to go to the west of Scotland, where he made many converts. Earl Bothwell, by one of those breaches of faith which, in Roman Catholic morality, is esteemed meritorious, delivered him into the hands of the cardinal. Bothwell made a solemn promise of protection, saying, in the presence of several witnesses, "I shall not only preserve your body from violence, but I will *promise you, on my honour*, that neither the governor nor the cardinal shall be able to harm you, and that I shall keep you in my own power, till either I make you free, or bring you back to the place where now I receive you." On this solemn promise, Wishart was delivered into his hands. Bothwell was sheriff of the county; but notwithstanding his solemn oath, he delivered him up to the cardinal, who committed him first to Edinburgh Castle, and afterwards removed him to St. Andrews[1].

The cardinal, in haste to make an example of such an arch-heretic, summoned all the bishops to meet at St. Andrews, the 27th February, 1546. The archbishop of Glasgow advised him to procure a commission from the regent, in order to divide the odium of his death with the civil power. Not doubting of the regent's ready acquiescence, he applied accordingly; but the regent, listening to the advice of Sir David Hamilton of Preston, replied, that "he should do well not to precipitate the man's trial until his coming; for as to himself, he *would not* consent to his death, before the cause was well examined; and if the cardinal should do otherwise, he would make protestation *that the man's blood should be required at his hands.*" This was a different answer from that which the cardinal expected; and fearing lest, by delay and the regent's clemency, Wishart might escape his vengeance, he wrote back to the regent, "That he did not write unto the governor, *as though he depended in any matter on his authority*, but out of a desire he had, that the *heretic's* condemnation might proceed with some show of public consent, which, since he could not obtain, he would himself do that which he held most fitting." The cardinal's whole proceedings, and this letter particularly, shew the power, independent of the crown, which the Church of Rome claimed and exercised in every state where that church was by law established. Wishart was tried, found guilty of heresy, and condemned to the flames. In pursuance of his sentence, he was publicly burnt alive, on the 2d March, in front of the Episcopal palace, with circumstances of great

[1] Spottiswood.—Knox.—Keith.

cruelty[1]. The trial, and the whole of the charges against him of heresy, eighteen in number, with his answers, are detailed at full length by the author of Knox's history; but there is no mention of his having been a priest, which would unquestionably have been one of the charges, had he been in holy orders. Besides, the ceremony of degradation would have made part of his sentence, and it would have been ostentatiously performed previous to his being delivered over to the secular arm. This barbarous transaction cannot be viewed in any other light than as deliberate *murder*, inasmuch as the regent—to whom only the power of life and death belonged, as representing the sovereign—had forbidden the trial, and required the innocent man's blood at the cardinal's hands. Therefore, his condemning "Master George" to death, and by his own authority putting his sentence into execution, in defiance of the regent's prohibition, (although contrary to the custom of the Roman Church, which, in cases of heresy, only passes sentence, and then hands over the victim to the civil magistrate for execution,) is a plain proof of the dangerous tendency of the principles of the Church of Rome. History is replete with examples of that church both claiming and exercising a supremacy over all sovereign princes, who, by God's law and authority, alone are "to bear the sword," and to restrain churchmen and laymen, popes, prelates, and presbyters, within the bounds of their several stations.

Wishart has been long popularly recognised as a martyr, and it is with much regret that the writer finds himself, by the force of evidence, compelled to withdraw that holy title from him. The zeal and industry of Mr. Tytler has produced sufficient evidence to strip him of all title to rank among the noble army of martyrs. That able historian has placed it beyond controversy that Wishart was a *particeps criminis* with others in a conspiracy to assassinate the cardinal, and that he was in the pay of Henry VIII. That unscrupulous monarch employed the Earls of Cassilis and Glencairn, Mr. Kirkaldy of Grange, Charteris of Kinfauns, two Leslies of the family of Rothes, and a ruffian, and who was the principal conspirator, of the name of Chrichton, the laird of Brunstone, to effect the murder of Cardinal Beaton. George Wishart was the confidential emissary between the King of England and the conspirators; and consequently was equally guilty of the *intention* of assassination as the others, although, perhaps, he might not have actually embrued his hands in the prelate's blood. There is little doubt that the cardinal was acquainted with the

[1] Scot's Worthies.—Knox.—Spottiswood.—Keith.

designs of his enemies against his life, and of Wishart's participation in them, and which, probably, sharpened his ardour to secure and punish so dangerous a teacher of such heresy. The cardinal was most strenuously opposed to the alliance with England, and to the marriage of his sovereign to the youthful Prince of Wales; all his political skill and efforts had therefore been exerted to thwart Henry's darling project. Hence the mortal enmity betwixt Henry and Beaton: and it will ever remain a stain even upon his memory, that he employed and paid blood-thirsty men to remove by murder the principal obstacle to his ambition. Henry was the cardinal's avowed and bitter enemy, on account of his patriotic opposition to the subjugation of his native country to its more powerful rival; and it has been proved that he instigated several individuals, and bestowed considerable pecuniary rewards upon them, as incentives for the murder of his adversary. Wishart was one of these guilty conspirators; and it is reasonable to conclude that the cardinal was not unacquainted with his guilt, as the conspirators made no secret of their intentions. Of Wishart, Mr. Tytler says—"He enjoyed, it is to be remembered, the confidential intimacy, nay, we have reason to believe that his counsels influenced the conduct of, Glencairn, Cassilis, Brunstone, and the parties who were now the advisers of Henry's intended hostilities; a circumstance which will perfectly account for the obscure warnings of the preacher, without endowing him with inspiration. He continued his denunciations of the Romish superstitions, and inveighed with so much eloquence against the corrupt lives of the churchmen, that, incurring the extreme odium of Beaton, he is said to have twice escaped plots which that unscrupulous prelate laid for his life. It was during this interval (from 1543 to 1546) that Henry VIII. encouraged Brunstone, Cassilis, Glencairn, and others, to assassinate his enemy the cardinal. Of the existence of the plot against his life Beaton was to a certain extent aware; and looking with suspicion on Wishart, not only as a disseminator of forbidden doctrines, but the friend of his most mortal enemies, he earnestly laboured to apprehend him. Of all this the future martyr was so well advised, that he repeatedly alluded to his approaching fate[1]."

The clergy in general applauded the primate for this bold measure of putting Wishart to death; and he flattered himself that he had subdued his enemies, and given the death-blow

[1] Tytler's Hist. of Scotland, v. 415, 416.

to what he called heresy. But in this he entirely miscalculated; for, instead of suppressing the new opinions, it only excited a more fervid spirit of inquiry, and roused the resentment of the whole nation. It not only exasperated the minds of the common people, but it precipitated the catastrophe of his own death, which was not a sudden act of revenge, but a long-projected conspiracy from other and mercenary motives instigated originally by Henry VIII. "If Wishart," says his biographer, "had had twenty lives he ought to have lost them all, but not for heresy," but for his guilty knowledge and participation in the conspiracy to murder the cardinal.

Soon after the burning of Wishart, cardinal Beaton passed over the Tay to the castle of Findhaven, to marry one of his own illegitimate daughters, Margaret Beaton, to the eldest son of the Earl of Crawford, with whom he gave a dowry of 4000 marks. While enjoying the marriage festivities, he received authentic intelligence of an intended attack on his castle of St. Andrews by an English fleet, and he hastened back to put it in the most formidable state of defence. He summoned the nobility and gentry in the neighbourhood of St. Andrews to draw out their powers for the defence of the coasts, and took *bands of manrent* of various chiefs; but particularly of Norman Leslie, of whose fidelity he had cause to entertain suspicion. Leslie had formerly done many services to the cardinal; but meeting with some disappointment he left his castle and service with keenly excited and vindictive feelings, but which were concealed under the plea of revenging the death of Wishart. His uncle, John Leslie, openly vowed that the murder of "Master George" should not go unrevenged, and threatened that his hand and dagger should be both priest and confessor to the cardinal. Accordingly, on the 29th of May, the two Leslies, Kircaldy of Grange, Melville of Carnbee, Peter Carmichal, and several other conspirators, with their military followers, surprised the castle. They silently turned out all the labourers who were at work on the ramparts, secured the gate, and went directly to the cardinal's apartment, the door of which they burst open. He reminded them of his sacred function, saying, "I am a priest;" but sacrilege and murder were crimes of such common occurrence amongst the higher classes of society at that period, that such an appeal fell pointless on his ruthless assailants. The ruffians rushed upon him and stabbed him repeatedly, although he earnestly implored their mercy. In the meantime the citizens became alarmed at the accounts

given by the discharged workmen; and the provost came, with the whole population of the city at his heels, clamorously demanding that the lord cardinal should be set free. They were enraged at the dubious replies which they received from the conspirators, and became more determined to see him. The murderers therefore dragged his naked and bleeding body to the spot, and suspended it over the wall by a sheet, exclaiming, "There is your god; and now that you have seen him, get home to your houses!" a command with which they complied, in silent sorrow and indignation.

Such was the end of this illustrious and great man; with whom fell the last prop of the papal church in Scotland, by a sacrilegious murder, in the prime of life, being only in the fifty-second year of his age. He was a man of first-rate ability, and a politician of the highest order; but, says Keith, "it were to be wished the same praise could be given him with respect to his *morals*. Mrs. Marion Ogilvy, a daughter of the predecessor of the Earls of Airly, *bore him several children;* some of whose descendants, both of the male and female line, are known to be persons of good note in our country at this day." He was zealously attached to the papal interest, and indeed it may be said that he was its entire support and its only remaining buttress in Scotland. "For," continues Bishop Keith, "as several of our nobility found it their *temporal* interest as much as their spiritual to sway with the new opinions as to religious matters, so the cardinal found it *his interest* to bear down the same with all his might. For this purpose, he in all his administration, both ecclesiastical and secular, treated the preachers and their abettors with great severity; that being, as he thought, the surest method to suppress the growing evil. What might have proved to be the issue of such procedure, had he enjoyed his life for any considerable time, I shall not pretend to judge. Only this seems to be certain, that by his death the reins of the government were much loosened; and some persons came to be considerable soon after, who, probably, if he had lived, had never got the opportunity to perpetrate such villainy under the cloak of religion, as it is certain they did; *he being at least* no less a statesman than a clergyman[1]."

The following character of this distinguished and murdered prelate, and which carries the force of truth along with it, is drawn by a cotemporary writer[2]. His behaviour was so

[1] Keith's Hist. 45.

[2] Description of Scotland, by Paulus Jovius, cited in Lawson's Roman Catholic Church in Scotland, pp. 152—153.

taking that he never addicted himself to the service of any prince or person but he absolutely gained their confidence; and this power he had over the minds of others he managed with so much prudence and discretion, that his interest was never weakened nor decayed. He was indefatigable in business, and yet managed it with great ease. He understood the interests of the courts of Rome, France, and Scotland, better than any man of his time, and he was perfectly acquainted with the temper, influence, and weight of all the nobility of his own country. In time of danger he shewed great prudence and steadiness of mind, and in his highest prosperity discovered nothing of vanity or giddiness. He was a zealous churchman, and thought severity the only weapon which should combat heresy. He loved to live magnificently though not profusely, for at the time of his death he was rich, and yet had provided plentifully for his family. But his failings were *many*, and *his vices scandalous*. His pride was so great that he quarrelled with the old Archbishop of Glasgow (Dunbar) in his own city, and pushed this quarrel so far that their men fought in the very church. His ambition was boundless, for he took into his own hands the entire management of the affairs of the kingdom, civil and ecclesiastical, and treated the English ambassador as if he had been a sovereign prince. He made no scruple of sowing discord among his enemies, that he might reap security from their disputes. His jealousy of the regent was such that he kept his eldest son as a hostage in his house, under pretence of taking care of his education. In point of chastity he was *very deficient*; for, though we should set aside as calumnies many of those things which his enemies have reported of his intrigues, yet the posterity he left behind him plainly proves that he violated those vows, to gratify his passions, which he obliged others to hold sacred on the penalty of their lives. In a word, had his probity been equal to his parts, had his virtues come up to his abilities, his end had been less fatal, and his memory without blemish. As it is, we ought to consider him as an eminent instance of the brightest human faculties, and the instability of what the world calls fortune."

It would have been happy if he had followed the example of his great contemporary, Cranmer, and, seeing the doctrinal errors and corruptions of his native church, had, like him, become its reformer. But however detestable are his cruelty and bigotry, which were not the effect of his *own* natural disposition, but arose entirely out of the *system* of the Church of Rome, of which he was the chief minister in Scotland, it must not

1868908

be forgotten, that his murder was unjustifiable and criminal in the highest degree, inasmuch as the persons of those who minister at the altar in holy things are sacred and inviolable, and those who despise or offer violence to them are guilty of despising and insulting Him who sent them, our great High-priest Jesus Christ, whose stewards and ambassadors they are. Besides, even upon the false principle of avenging Wishart's death, there is no law, human or divine, which empowers private parties and subjects to assume at their own hands the right of executing justice. The divine right of demanding blood for blood was conferred by God on Noah as the universal sovereign, and his sons; and from them it has naturally devolved on all sovereign princes, who have, in consequence, exercised this right in all ages, both civilized and barbarous, to the entire exclusion of the *people* from assuming the privilege of avenging their own quarrels, and which, in no age or country, has ever been disputed. But for the sins of a people many are the princes thereof. The long and numerous minorities of the crown had permitted the nobility to become independent princes; and they exercised despotically the powers of life and death, or, as it was termed, the power of pot and gallows, over their tenants and dependents. They waged fierce and bloody wars upon each other, and for the slightest provocation, or from the remembrance of some former or ancestral feud, carried fire and sword through the estates of their enemies. The land was in consequence fearfully polluted with blood, both in the way just noted and by private assassinations, and which, as the law could not, or did not, reach the guilty parties, produced other murders in retaliation. Adultery and fornication were likewise crimes of constant occurrence, not only amongst the laity, but more particularly among all ranks of the clergy. This charge, of which the contemporary authors are replete, might be supposed to have been exaggerated by the enemies of the church; but the fact of such multitudes of the illegitimate children of the clergy being *legitimized* by law, speaks trumpet-tongued against the immorality and utter degeneracy of both the clergy and the laity of the period.

CHAPTER III.

PRIMACY OF ARCHBISHOP HAMILTON.

The conspirators excommunicated.—John Hamilton promoted to the primacy.—John Rough's preaching and martyrdom.—Knox.—Petition of the clergy.—Archbishop Hamilton's first acts.—Knox sent to the galleys.—Winram.—Queen Dowager made regent.—Provincial council at Linlithgow—Proceedings.—Peace.—Adam Wallace—Trial and burning.—Dispute whether or not the Lord's prayer should be said to the saints.—Another provincial synod—Its proceedings.—Hamilton's catechism—Opinion of it and extracts from it.—A third provincial council at Linlithgow.—David Panter consecrated.—Death of Edward VI.—Protestants seek shelter in Scotland.—Harley.—Willock.—Knox.—Erskine of Dunn.—Knox cited for heresy—His preaching—Repairs to Geneva—Burnt in effigy.—Progress of the new doctrines.—Paul Methuen.—John Douglass.—Bond.—Congregation.—Articles of agreement.—Remarks.—John Douglass.—The primate's letter to the Earl of Argyle—His answer.—Definition of heresy.—Walter Mill—His trial—burnt alive.—Declension of the Roman Church in Scotland.—Synod—Procession with St. Giles.—Subscriptions.—The Congregation.—Queen's marriage.—Death of some bishops, and Mary Queen of England.—A liturgy.—Reflections.

1546.—The sacrilegious murder of a primate who was at the head of both church and state excited the utmost consternation among all ranks of the clergy; and the bishops urged the regent to take summary vengeance on the atrocious perpetrators. Until he could slowly accomplish the desired vengeance, the ecclesiastical judges solemnly excommunicated and cursed the murderers, by bell, book, and candle, and all the terrors of the Roman discipline. In the meantime, the regent issued a proclamation, or rather an act of privy council, on the 11th of June, "against invading, destroying, or withholding of abbeys;" and which Bishop Keith thinks was probably done on the petition of the clergy. The regent summoned the conspirators to surrender the castle; but being strongly fortified, well provisioned, and open to the sea, whence Henry VIII. kept up a constant supply of provisions and munitions of war, the assassins of the primate refused the summons, and held the castle for some years, against all the force which the regent could direct against it[1].

Immediately on the murder of Cardinal Beaton the regent promoted his own illegitimate brother, John Hamilton,

[1] Keith's Hist. 60—61.

abbot of Paisley, and bishop elect of Dunkeld, to the primacy. The chapter of St. Andrews accordingly elected him, and Pope Paul III. prudently confirmed the election, notwithstanding his illegitimacy, which usually excludes from holy orders. The tottering state of the supremacy, which, in point of fact, is *the real pivot* on which the whole papal system turns, induced the Bishop of Rome to pay this compliment to the regent in order to prevent his following the example of the King of England; and the whole estate of the clergy voluntarily taxed themselves to the amount of £3000 monthly for the space of four months, and afterwards continued the same till the castle was taken and raised. Without this seasonable supply the regent could neither have commenced nor continued the siege[1]. The cardinal's sacrilegious murderers maintained the castle against the small degree of skill and the trifling artillery which could then be brought to bear against it; and they were joined by many of the discontented spirits of the age, and assisted by the King of England both with arms and provisions. They retained the regent's eldest son whom they found there, and who had been secured by the cardinal as an hostage for his father's fidelity, under pretence of superintending his education. A treaty was entered into by which the conspirators agreed to render up the castle upon condition that the regent would procure a free and unconditional pardon from the pope for the sacrilege of which they had been guilty. The pardon was obtained; but it was worded so ambiguously, that the faith which is not to be kept with heretics might easily upon a favourable opportunity have been broken. The peculiar expression at which they took exception was, that the pope agreed *to pardon an unpardonable crime;* meaning, probably, a crime of an extraordinary and highly aggravated nature. They refused, therefore, to open the gates; and the siege was continued.

1547.—Among those who joined the rebels in the castle was John Rough, a Dominican friar, and formerly the regent's chaplain, who acted in the same capacity for them for some time; but being disgusted with the debauched and dissolute lives of his new associates, he quitted the castle, and began to preach in the parish church of the city; "and albeit," says the author of Knox's history, "he was not the most learned, yet was his doctrine without corruption, and therefore well liked of the people[2]." Rough fled afterwards to England, and was presented to a living near Hull, by the Archbishop of York,

[1] Keith's Hist. 61. [2] Knox's Hist. b. i. p. 3.

which he enjoyed till the death of Edward VI., when he went to Friesland to avoid the Marian persecution, and there supported himself by knitting and selling caps and hose. Venturing, however, to return to England, to settle some private affairs, he was apprehended and arraigned before Bonner, who questioned him, if, at any time since his return to England, he had preached? He answered, "that he had not *preached*, but in some places where godly people were assembled, *he had read the prayers of the communion book*, set forth in the reign of Edward VI." And being asked what his judgment was of the said book, he frankly owned "*that he did approve the same, as agreeing in all points with the word of God.*" He was condemned and degraded, and delivered over to the secular power, and burnt in Smithfield, 21st November, 1567 [1].

The author of Knox's history says, that "*at Easter* after anno 1547 came to the castle of St. Andrews JOHN KNOX:" and entered into the garrison of his own free will, which is an undeniable attestation of his approbation of "*the godly deed*," as he termed it, of the cardinal's murder, and who, he said, *was slain by the hand of God!* Knox began to preach in the parish church, and soon collected a congregation. Then "John Rough, preacher, perceiving the manner of his doctrine, began earnestly to travel with him that he would *take the function of preacher upon him*; but he refused, alleging that *he would not run* where God had *not called him*, meaning that he would do nothing without a *lawful vocation*." He yielded, however, nothing loath, "to avoid God's heavy displeasure," and the people answered to the question *do ye approve this vocation?—we approve it!* [2]. "Which," says Bishop Keith, "was all the call or lawful vocation to the ministry that Mr. Knox sought after, as himself informs us[3]." But the late Dr. M'Crie has set that point at rest in a note to his history, in which he clearly shews that Knox was in priests' orders according to the popish ordinal, and he surmises, on good grounds, that he must have entered into holy orders previous to the year 1530, when he was in his twenty-fifth year.

1548.—In the month of March, the clergy presented a petition to government stating, that "sundry parts of this realm, which have ever been Catholic since the beginning of the

[1] Spottiswood.
[2] Knox's Hist. b. i. p. 3.
[3] Keith, b. i. ch. vi. p. 62.—Life of Knox, p. 8.

faith to thir days, (are) now infected with the pestilentious heresies of Luther, his sect, and followers;" and it concluded with requesting the civil power to suppress the heresy. In reply, his grace required the clergy to furnish him with the names of the guilty parties, on whom he promised to execute the laws of the land[1]. Archbishop HAMILTON had not yet taken possession of his see; but he wrote to JOHN WINRAM, the sub-prior and vicar-general, and authorised him to prohibit all heretical disputations. Winram, however, was secretly favourable to the new doctrines; and, therefore, did not take any active steps, farther than to challenge Knox and Rough to a public controversy. The castle having been at last taken, the garrison, including Knox, were transported to France. "Knox, with a few others, was confined on board the galleys; and, in addition to the rigours of ordinary captivity, was loaded with chains, and exposed to all the indignities with which papists were accustomed to treat those whom they regarded as heretics[2]."

1549.—The Queen-mother accomplished her anxious desire of having the Queen, her daughter, sent to France to be educated, and eventually married to the Dauphin, having obtained the consent of Parliament. She had induced the Earl of Arran to resign the regency in her favour; and she now so far overcame her own prejudices as to court the reformers as a political body, in order still farther to accomplish her views of procuring the crown-matrimonial for her son-in-law. But the reformers found no favour with the new archbishop, who took the right way of preventing their increase, by attempting to reform the Church itself. In pursuance of this plan, he summoned a provincial council to meet at Linlithgow, but which he afterwards adjourned to Edinburgh, with the special object in view of reforming the Church, and of extirpating heresy. Happy had it been, not only for their own Church, but for that of the other division of the island, had they carried a real reform into effect. Dr. M'Crie has so well condensed the proceedings of this synod that I shall quote his words:—"This council acknowledged, that 'the corruption and profane lewdness of life, as well as gross ignorance of arts and sciences, reigned among the clergy of almost every degree,' and they enacted no less than fifty-eight canons for correcting these evils. They agreed to carry into execution the decree of the general council of Basle, which ordained that every clergyman who lived in concubinage should be

[1] Keith's Hist. b. i. c. vi. p. 62. [2] M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 12.

deprived of the revenues of his benefice for three months; and that if, after due admonition, he did not dismiss his concubine, or if he took to himself another, he should be deprived of his benefices altogether. They exhorted the prelates and inferior clergy not to retain in their own houses their *bastard children*, nor suffer them to be promoted directly or indirectly to their own benefices, nor to employ the patrimony of the Church for the purpose of marrying them to barons, or of erecting baronages for them. That the distinction between clergy and laity might be visibly preserved, they appointed the ordinaries to charge the priests under their care to desist from the practice of preserving their beards, which had begun to prevail, and to see that the canonical tonsure was duly observed. To remedy the neglect of public instruction, which was loudly complained of, they agreed to observe the act of the Council of Trent, which ordained that every bishop, 'according to the grace given to him,' should preach personally four times a year at least, unless lawfully hindered; and that such of them as were unfit for this duty through want of practice should endeavour to qualify themselves, and for that end should entertain in their houses learned divines capable of instructing them: the same injunctions were laid on rectors. They determined, that a benefice should be set apart in each bishopric and monastery for supporting a preacher, who might supply the want of teaching within their bounds: that, where no such benefice was set apart, pensions should be allotted; and that, when neither of these was provided, the preacher should be entitled to demand from the rector forty shillings a year, provided he had preached four times in his parish within that period. The Council made a number of other regulations concerning the dress and diet of the clergy—the course of study in cathedral churches and monasteries—union of benefices, pluralities, ordinations, dispensations—and the method of process in consistorial courts. But, not trusting altogether to these remedies for the cure of heresy, they farther ordained that the bishop of each diocese, and the head of each monastery, should appoint 'inquisitors of heretical pravity, men of piety, probity, learning, good fame, and great circumspection,' who should make the most diligent search after heresies, foreign opinions, condemned books, and particularly profane songs, intended to defame the clergy, or to detract from the authority of the ecclesiastical constitutions[1]."

[1] M'Crie's Life of Knox, pp. 100. 101. Edit. 1840.

1550.—By these canons we can observe, that although the popular declamation certainly did exaggerate the failings of the clergy, yet the state of morality must have been at a very low ebb when it was necessary thus publicly, and, as it were, in confirmation of the public accusation, to publish to the world their own besetting sins. Their chief sin, however, must be laid at the door of the papal system, which has enchained that Church to "the doctrine of devils, forbidding to marry." It is impossible to conceive that the people could be chaste, when they saw their unmarried clergy living in open and unblushing concubinage, and their bastard children promoted to the highest offices in church and state, to the exclusion of those lawfully born. Hence it has followed, that the unchaste vices have been more universally practised in Scotland, in all periods of her history, than in any other Christian country in the world.

Panter, bishop-elect of Ross, was sent to Boulogne to negotiate a peace between the realms of Scotland, England, and France; and the young Lord Erskine, with Henry St. Clare dean of Glasgow, were sent ambassadors to England, to sign the treaty. The English and French armies evacuated Scotland; and, in May, the Queen-dowager went to France, accompanied by the Earls of Huntly, Marischall, Sutherland, and Cassilis. The object of her journey was to procure the regency of Scotland; and, to induce the Earl of Arran to resign, she procured for him the title of Duke of Chatelherault, and his son, now Earl of Arran, to be captain of the Scots Guards at Paris. She also induced the French King to give the regent the earldom of Moray, the earldom of Rothes to Andrew Leslie, who had married the regent's kinswoman, and the earldom of Morton to George Douglass. On her return, the Queen-dowager was hospitably entertained at the court of England by Edward VI., who earnestly entreated her to bestow her daughter upon him in marriage. She no sooner arrived at home than she commenced and effectually accomplished the reconciliation of the nobility with each other[1].

1551.—After the dissolution of this synod, Archbishop Hamilton disgraced his primacy by an act of cruelty on a poor old man, named Adam Wallace, described as "a simple man without great learning, but one that was zealous in godliness, and of an upright life[2]." This poor man, with his wife Beatrice Wallace, was a sort of tutor in the family at Ormiston, where Wishart was taken, and where Knox frequently

[1] Balfour's Annals, i. p. 298. [2] Knox's Hist. b. i. p. 125.

visited. He had imbibed the opinions of these men, and had been in the habit of exhorting and praying with the members of the family. Thinking to strike terror into the Protestants, the primate arrested this obscure individual, and he was brought to trial in the Blackfriars church in Edinburgh, before the Earl of Argyle, who was hereditary justice-general of the kingdom, and in the presence of the archbishop. The usual charges of heresy were preferred against him, with the addition of presuming to preach, though only a layman. He denied the charge of preaching; but admitted his having baptized his own child, and which he attempted to justify! It was one of the peculiar and unfortunate features of the reforming leaders in Scotland, that every layman felt himself called on and at liberty to usurp the priest's office; but Wallace seems to have gone a step farther than usual, by profaning the sacrament of baptism, as Wishart had profaned the other sacrament, by praying over and distributing bread and wine, as if such had been the blessed eucharist. To the disgrace of the primate and the lay judges, Wallace was condemned to the stake; and, on the following day, he was burnt alive on the Castle Hill, where he showed great fortitude[1].

A controversy arose this year in the Church, which shows the ignorance of the Scoto-Romish clergy and their utter corruption and degradation both in faith and manners. Archbishop Spottiswood narrates the story circumstantially, which at the time excited great interest among the churchmen, and the keenest satire and most bitter ridicule among the people, and tended greatly to alienate their minds from the ancient hierarchy. The subject of dispute was, whether the Lord's prayer should be addressed to God only, or to the saints also. Some maintained that the paternoster was to be said to God *formaliter*, and to the saints *materialiter*; while others maintained that it ought to be said to God *principaliter*, and to the saints *minus principaliter*. One party held, that it ought to be said to God *ultimatè* and *non ultimatè*: another, *primariò* and *secundariò*; but the majority determined, that the paternoster should be said to God *capiendo strictè*, and to the saints *capiendo largè*. This opinion not being unanimously adopted, it was at length agreed to refer the matter to a provincial synod which was to meet at Edinburgh in January next year.

The sub-prior of St. Andrews being asked by his servant, what the frequent meetings and conferences of the clergy meant? replied, "Tom, we cannot agree to whom the pater-

[1] Knox's Hist. b. i. 125.

noster should be said." "Sir," says Tom, "to whom should it be said, but to God?" "But," said the sub-prior, "what shall we do with the saints, man?" "Give them *aves* and *credos* enow, in the devil's name!" says Tom, "for that may suffice them." The world was generally of opinion, that Tom gave a wiser decision than the doctors had done[1].

1552.—A provincial synod was held, on the 26th January, in the Blackfriars church, Edinburgh, over which Archbishop Hamilton presided, and "in which was agitated the merry story concerning the paternoster[2]." This council decided the question which arose at St. Andrews respecting the paternoster, that it ought to be addressed to God, but *in such a manner* as that the saints ought also to be *invoked!* and the sub-prior was instructed to announce this decision officially to the members of the university. It was announced to the council, that, by the vigilant activity of the bishops and clergy, heresy was almost entirely suppressed and extirpated. The canons made in the year 1549 were approved and confirmed, and some others were added, for the enforcement of discipline, and the reformation of abuses among the clergy themselves. The regulations which were agreed on were conceived in an excellent spirit, had they been carried into practice: but the immoralities and vices of all ranks of the clergy were such that no reformation resulted from these canons. Their general ignorance of their sacred functions was so great, that the majority of them were declared to be incapable of instructing their parishioners in the articles of the catholic faith. It is not therefore surprising that, under such blind and immoral guides, the people were also, in the last degree, immoral, and ignorant of their duties.

The sixteenth canon of this Council authorised the publication of a catechism in the mother tongue, containing an explanation of the Commandments, the Belief, and the Lord's Prayer; and the curates were enjoined to read a part thereof every Sunday and holiday to the people when there was no sermon, and until fit preachers should be provided by the bishops. This catechism consists of 410 pages, small 4to. and was printed in black letter. It was published at St. Andrews on the 29th of August, 1552, by command of the Council, and at the archbishop's expense, whose composition it is generally understood to have been. The preface, says Bishop Keith, "bears his name, and is directed principally to all the clergy, who are appointed to read it in place of sermon,

[1] Spottis. pp. 91, 92. [2] Keith, p. 63.

if there be none at the time. It is a judicious commentary upon the Commands, Belief, Lord's Prayer, Magnificat, and the Ave Maria; and the author shows both his wisdom and moderation in handsomely exiting to enter upon the controverted points. In a word, *no divine at this day need be ashamed of such a work*. Therefore, since it was commonly sold for twopence, and called, in derision, the *twopenny faith*..... I readily assent to Dr. M'Kenzie, who thinks that Archbishop Hamilton, having been at the charge of the printing, allowed the pedlars to take only twopence Scots for each copy of it from the people, as a fee for their pains in distributing it. It appears, that whoever slighted this book have been resolved to slight every thing that came from such a hand; and this composure, though there were none else, shews that all the clergy in those days have not been such dunces as some people would make us apprehend.[1]" Dr. M'Crie, in a note to his Life of Knox, decidedly opposes the above opinion, and says, " At the same time, while the opinions peculiar to Popery are stated and defended, there is an evident design of turning away the attention of the people from these controversies, by reminding them of their duty 'to belief as the holy catholic kirk beleifis;' and a great part of the book is occupied in declaring duties and general doctrines about which there was no dispute between Papists and Protestants."

In this catechism two lessons are especially recommended to be learnt by the faithful: in copying which I shall for convenience adopt the modern speling. The one is, " Whatsoever the Holy Spirit reveals and shews to us, *other* (than) in the book of Holy Scripture, *or in the determinations and definitions of general councils*, lawfully gathered for the corroboration and maintenance of our faith, *we should believe the same to be* (*the*) *true word of God*, and thereto give *firm credence*, as to the *verity that is infallible*." The second lesson, " Ye that are simple and unlearned men and women should expressly believe all the articles of your creed, as for all other high mysteries and matters of the Scripture, ye ought to believe generally as the kirk of God believes. And this faith is sufficient to you for the perfection of that faith which ye are bound to have."

Upon the subject of images, the author of the Catechism proceeds:—" Are images against the first command? No, so they be well used. What is the right use of images?

[1] Keith, b. i. c. 6, p. 63, note.

Images to be made, no holy writ forbids (says venerable Bede), for the sight of them, specially of the crucifix, gives great compunction to them which behold it with faith in Christ, and to them that are unlettered; it gives a quick remembrance of the Passion of Christ. Solomon, in time of his wisdom, (not without the inspiration of God,) made images in the temple. Moses, the excellent prophet and true servant of God, made and erected a brazen image of a serpent (which figured the lifting up of our Saviour Jesus Christ upon the cross), and also by the command of God, caused to be made the images of two angels (called Cherubim), which thing thir two so excellent men in wisdom would never have done, if the making of images were against the command of God. But utterly this command forbids to make images to that effect, that they should be adored and worshipped as gods, or with any godly honour, the which sentence is *expremit* by thir words: 'non adorabis ea neq. coles.' Thou shalt not adore them nor worship them as gods. Now we should not give God's honour or Christ's honour to any image, but to God allenarly *represented* by an image[1]."

Another provincial council assembled this same year at Linlithgow, in which the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent, *which gave a new face to the Romish church*, were received as binding on the church in Scotland in communion with the see of Rome. All who maintained doctrines at variance with those promulgated from Trent were denounced as heretics, and formally accursed. Some acts were also made for reforming the corrupt and immoral lives of the clergy, "but little or no execution followed[2]." But so many canons of councils, and the necessity for the convention of so many synods, show clearly that the morals of the papal clergy of Scotland were at the lowest possible ebb, and that the reiterated accusations of their opponents were founded on notorious and incontrovertible facts. If none but the *pure in heart* shall see God, how is it possible that a church whose priesthood was defiled with such an universal leprosy of *impurity*, should escape that *cutting off* which God denounced against the church in the city of Rome, if it continued not in His goodness, nor stood by faith[3]? At this synod David Panter, the regent's secretary, was consecrated bishop of Ross[4].

[1] Fo. xiii., b. xv. to fo. xviii. 6; cited in note to M'Crie's Life of Knox, 418, 419. [2] Keith, b. i. cap. vi. 63.
[3] Rom. xi. 20-25. [4] Balfour's Annals, i. 299.

1553.—The following year produced a great change in the situation of both kingdoms. Edward VI., a prince of great merit and piety, died, and was succeeded by his elder sister Mary, emphatically called the *Bloody*, one wholly devoted to the Pope and his interest. Edward had espoused the Protestant interest in Scotland, and the protector, Somerset, renewed the demands of Henry for the matrimonial alliance. The papal or French party had now the dominant influence, however, and encouraged the regent to reject the proposals; in consequence, Somerset marched a powerful army into the bowels of the land. But before offering battle, he wrote to the regent in the most conciliatory style, desiring him "to consider this, especially that seeing there was a necessity of giving their young queen in marriage to some one, if they did either respect their profit or honour, they could not make a better choice than of a king, their neighbour, born in the same isle, joined in propinquity of blood, instructed in the same laws, educated in the same manners and language, superior in riches, and in all external commodities and ornaments; and such a one as would bring him a perpetual peace, together with the oblivion of ancient grudges and hatreds." The regent was weak and wicked enough to suffer himself to be persuaded by his brother the archbishop to *suppress* this letter. He also induced him to circulate a report, that Somerset had invaded the kingdom for the purpose of carrying off the queen by force, and of subjecting it entirely to the crown of England; which the nobility readily believing, were so incensed as to determine on fighting, but were routed with great slaughter in the fatal battle of Pinkie. In the next convention of the estates, the Roman Catholic party were vehement in their advice for sending the queen to France, but Buchanan says, "that those who were on the side of the reformation, and *who were of the same religion with England*, were zealous for the English alliance[1]."

On the accession of Mary to the crown of England, and the advancement of the queen dowager to the regency of Scotland, a heavy cloud hung over both kingdoms, which threatened the Protestant religion with utter extirpation. Mary of Lorraine, the queen dowager, had sufficient address to induce the weak regent to resign the cares of office into her more powerful and politic hands, and, giving herself entirely up to the guidance of her brothers, the duke of Guise and the cardinal of Lorraine, she determined to sustain the fall-

[1] Spottiswood and Buchanan's History.

ing fortunes of the Church of Rome, using less cruelty indeed, but more address, than Mary of England. The hopes of those who wished for a reformation were now quite blighted; yet the Lord, by his providence, did otherwise dispose things, and made that the means of advancing religion in Scotland, which men thought would have utterly extinguished it.

1554.—Many of those who had fled for protection into England from the severity of the Scoto-popish church, now returned to seek shelter from the fiercer persecution there under Queen Mary. Among these was William Harlow, or more properly Harley, who had been formerly a tailor in the Canongate of Edinburgh. M'Crie asserts, on the apocryphal authority of Calderwood's MSS., that he had been admitted, while in England, to the order of Deacons; and Keith mentions him as a *minister* of St. Cuthbert's, a suburban parish of Edinburgh. Mr. Lawson says, generally "*it is said* he was admitted into holy orders, and we are informed by Strype that he was one of the six chaplains appointed by Edward VI."[1] Harley returned at this time, and preached to those who favoured the new opinions. He was followed soon after by John Willock, who had formerly been a Franciscan friar in the town of Ayr, and it is to be presumed that he was a regularly ordained priest. He had formerly taken shelter in England, but upon the accession of Mary he went to Friesland, where he practised medicine; whence he was sent, by the Countess of Friesland, on some mission to the queen regent. He returned to the continent, and came again upon a second mission, when he remained, "and preached to as many as resorted to him, who, it is said, were neither few nor of the meaner sort." Change of scene and society, and association with the virtuous and moral clergy on the south Bank of the Tweed, had enlarged the minds and improved the dispositions of these men, and given them a distaste to the immoral conduct of the Scoto-popish priesthood.

1555.—John Knox was taken with the rebels in the castle of St. Andrews, and sent prisoner into France, where he was committed to the gallies, and worked in chains at the oar. He was, however, liberated, and returned to England, where he remained till the death of Edward VI., when he went to Geneva, from that to Franckfort, and then back again to Geneva; and in the end of harvest he returned to Scotland:

[1] Life of Knox, 104.—Keith, b. iii. c. 1. p. 498.—Roman Cath. Ch. in Scotland, 181.

to whom, says Bishop Keith, "many of good note repaired, and heard his discourses; in which he chiefly insisted on the unlawfulness of being present at the mass, which he said was an idolatrous worship." He lodged with James Syme, where those favourable to the reformation assembled to hear his discourses; among whom was the excellent JOHN ERSKINE of Dun, afterwards one of Knox's superintendents or bishops. He was a distinguished patron of literature, "and whose great respectability of character, and approved loyalty and patriotism, had preserved him from the resentment of the clergy and the jealousy of the government, during successive periods of persecution[1]." Knox gave the first grand impulse to the minds of his countrymen, by his vehement declamations against the idolatrous nature of the papal worship; and soon brought the vengeance of that vindictive priesthood upon himself. Up to the period at which we have now arrived there had been no formal separation from the established papal church. Those who had embraced the reformed doctrines still continued to join in the popish worship, and even to "assist at mass," as they term it. But Knox's vehement objurgations against the idolatry of the mass effectually convinced his hearers of the sin of appearing to say God speed to the crime of idolatry, which is most fiercely denounced throughout all scripture. "Thus," says Dr. M'Crie, "was a *formal separation made* from the popish church in Scotland, which may be justly regarded as an important step in the reformation[2]."

In the month of June a parliament met, and, among other acts, one was passed prohibiting the eating of flesh in Lent without a license[3]; which shews that the Roman church was still powerful, and that it included the aristocracy within its pale.

1556.—"Knox succeeded so well," says Keith, "in these his exhortations, that a great many persons withdrew from the churches, and began to make an open separation[4]." This was soon conspicuous to the clergy, who preferred a complaint to the archbishop, and he represented the dangerous position of the church to the regent. At that time her majesty was particularly intent on securing the crown-matrimonial for the dauphin, and had no desire to compromise herself with the reformers, with whom she enjoyed great popularity. She therefore threw the odium of prosecuting Knox and his followers on the clergy, and sagaciously advised them to proceed against him on their own authority. Knox was summoned,

[1] M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 106.
[2] Life of Knox, p. 108.
[3] Balfour's Annals, i. 301.
[4] History, b. i. c. 6, p. 61.

accordingly, to answer to a charge of heresy on the 15th of May, in the Blackfriars church; but, in consequence of a number of barons and gentlemen, with their retainers, assembling at Edinburgh, for the purpose of assisting and supporting him at his trial, and possibly with the view of overawing his judges, or, at all events, of rescuing him in case of his condemnation, the clergy pretended an informality in the indictment, and postponed the trial *sine die*. After this, his preaching became more public and bold, and more frequented by all sorts of people, than before; and that same day he preached to a more crowded audience in the house of the bishop of Dunkeld than to any he had hitherto addressed. Many of the nobility began to resort to his sermons, which the author of the history that goes under his name says, so pleased the earls of Glencairn and Marischal, "that they both willed the said John to write unto the queen regent somewhat that might move her to hear the word of God." The Earl of Glencairn presented Knox's letter to her majesty, who handed it to James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, saying, with a sneer, "Please you, my lord, to read a pasquil." It is needless to add, that Knox's letter made no impression on the regent, but was treated with contempt[1].

After his escape from the snares of his enemies, Knox spent a month at the house of Dun, near Montrose, where he preached daily; afterwards, he spent a short time at Calder, under the protection of Mr. Sandilands; from thence he went into Aryshire. At each of these places multitudes of all ranks resorted to him, and whose minds he inflamed against the idolatry of the mass. In his history, it is said he administered repeatedly the Lord's Supper, but by what ritual, or in what manner, we are not informed. He received an earnest solicitation from the English congregation at Geneva to repair to that city to be their pastor; and he departed accordingly in the month of July. From his desertion of his post at this critical period it must be concluded that either his prospects of success at home were not very flattering, or else that he was actuated more by the love of change and of vain glory than by any patriotic desire to reform and purify his native church. Immediately after his departure, he was again cited to appear and answer to the charge of heretical pravity which had been before preferred against him. The court met with the usual formalities, but on his failing to appear, he was condemned in absence as a heretic, and burnt in effigy at the Cross. As soon

[1] Spottiswood.—Knox.—Keith.

as Knox heard of this vicarious martyrdom, he published a spirited appeal to the people, and a defence of his tenets [1].

The queen regent made a progress through the kingdom, and held justice courts: while at Inverness, a curious specimen of the ideas of justice then prevalent is mentioned with great simplicity by Balfour:—"The Laird of Grant brings in *the heads* of some of his kindred, whom he could not bring in alive, *and presents them to justice.* She fined the Earl of Caithness in a good round sum of money, because he had not presented some of his friends and followers to justice," perhaps in the same way as the Laird of Grant did, by presenting their heads! [2].

1557.—About this time, many of the Roman Catholic clergy, both regular and secular, began to renounce the Roman communion, and to join themselves to the friends of the reformation; and those of the Roman clergy who were firm in their allegiance to the see of Rome were fast becoming isolated, holding their livings and benefices with almost empty churches; but the countenance of the regent, and the promise of support from the court of France, made them inflexible in their attachment to the doctrines of the Church of Rome. The new doctrines now made considerable progress, not only in Edinburgh and Leith, under the ministry of Willocks and Harley, but in many other parts of the country. It is an evil which attached to the Scottish reformation that the preachers were chiefly laymen, and who were without education or station in society so as to command respect. Paul Methuen was a baker in Dundee, and an uneducated layman, who began, without ordination or authority of any sort, to preach and administer pretended sacraments; and other unauthorised persons began also to preach in the county of Angus. Mr. JOHN DOUGLASS, a Carmelite friar, and perhaps a priest, was received into the family of the Earl of Argyle as his domestic chaplain, and declaimed openly at court against the superstition and immorality of the papal clergy. "And," says Bishop Keith, "it was observable that from that time forward the estimation of the clergy daily diminished; and even *divers of that order*, both secular and regular, but especially of the latter sort, began publicly to espouse the party of the reformation, and to declaim against the corruptions of the Church of Rome." These reformed clergy, with the lay intruders, now gathered regular congregations in the

[1] Spottiswood's Hist. 94.—Knox's Hist.—Keith.—M'Crie's Life of Knox.
[2] Annals, i. p. 306.

houses of those who were friendly to the cause; and the bishops became alarmed at this increasing defalcation from their authority. They advised the queen regent to summon the reformed clergy and preachers before the privy council, and "arraign them for raising of mutinies and convening together the lieges without authority." But success had emboldened the people, and they collected in such numbers and in such a menacing attitude, as deterred the queen and council from attempting the intended arraignment; she therefore dismissed them with a courteous assurance that she meant no harm to their preachers[1].

A considerable secession had taken place at this time from the established church; and the reformers were joined by many men of rank and influence, who urged forward and protected the preachers. They now felt themselves in a position to invite Knox to return from Geneva, and accordingly a letter was written to him signed by Glencairne, Lorn, Erskine of Dun, and the LORD JAMES STUART, afterwards the REGENT MORAY. They however revoked their call some little time afterwards, and he was obliged to return from Dieppe and sojourn among the French protestants for some time. He wrote from Dieppe upon the 27th of October, and reproached his correspondents for their pusillanimity, and exhorted them to persevere in their hostility to the papal church, and in almost direct terms advocated rebellion against the sovereign. His letter gave an immense impulse to the inflammable mass of the people, and to the crafty nobility, who were on the watch to "make the church desolate and naked, and to eat her flesh and to burn her with fire[2];" that is, to seize and appropriate all the church and monastic lands, which amounted to nearly one-half of the land in the kingdom. The leaders of the movement now resolved to prosecute measures for the overthrow of the ancient church, and the establishment of the new CONGREGATION[2]. As a sort of assurance the following bond was drawn up and signed by the principal noblemen and gentlemen engaged in the reformation; and in which the Church of Rome is called "*the Congregation of Satan*," in contradistinction to the seceders, who are designated "the *Congregation of Christ*."

"We, perceiving how Satan in his members, the anti-christs of our time, do rage, seeking to overthrow and to destroy the

[1] Keith, b. i. c. 6. p. 65.—Knox. [2] Rev. xvii. 16.

[2] This word is synonymous with church, and was so meant in the language of the times. Vide the 19th of the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England, where the word is used in that and in no other sense.

gospel of Christ and his congregation, ought, according to our bounden duty, to strive in our master's cause even unto the death, being certain of the victory in him. The which, our duty being well considered, we do promise before the majesty of God, and his congregation, that we (by his grace) shall with all diligence continually apply our whole power, substance, and our very lives, to maintain, set forward, and establish the most blessed word of God and His congregation; and shall labour at our possibility to have faithful ministers, truly and purely to minister Christ's gospel and sacraments to his people: we shall maintain them, nourish them, and defend them, the whole congregation of Christ and every member thereof, at our whole powers and waging of our lives against Satan and all wicked power that doth intend tyranny or trouble against the aforesaid congregation. Unto the which holy word and congregation we do join us; and so do forsake and renounce the congregation of Satan, with all the superstitious abominations and idolatry thereof; and moreover shall declare ourselves manifestly enemies thereto by this our faithful promise before God, testified to his congregation by our subscriptions at these presents. At Edinburgh, the 3d day of December, 1557 years. God called to witness. A. Earl of Argyle, Glencairne, Morton, Archibald lord of Lorne, John Erskine of Dun, &c.[1]"

As the political association or congregation was originally a church militant in the physical meaning of the words, and founded in sacrilege and plunder, so those who were the most zealous reformers took up arms to oppose the sovereign, and were the most extensive devourers of the church's property. With the ulterior design of securing the property of the church, the nobility entered zealously into the views of those who desired only a moral and doctrinal reformation. Immediately, therefore, after the subscription of the above bond, "THE LORDS OF THE CONGREGATION," as they were now called, whose eyes rested solely on the property, and the clergy and others who having *come out of* the spiritual Sodom sincerely desired the reformation but not the destruction of the church, met and agreed upon the following articles, or heads of reformation:—

I. It is thought expedient, advised and ordained, that in all parishes of this realm, *the Common Prayer be read weekly* on Sundays and *other festival days*, publicly in the parish churches with the lessons of the Old and New Testament, conformably to the Book of Common

[1] Keith, b. i. c. 6. p. 66.—Knox, p. 131, 135.

Prayer. And, if the (papal) curates of the parishes be qualified, to cause them to read the same; and if they be not, or if they refuse, that the most qualified in the parish use and read the same.

II. It is thought necessary that doctrine, preaching, and interpretation of Scriptures, be had and used privately in quiet houses, without great conventions of the people thereto, while afterward that God move the prince to grant public preaching by faithful and true ministers[1].

These men, who were so anxious to enforce the reading of the scripture, seem to have read it to little effect themselves; for here is a direct contravention of the apostolic command, to obey the powers that be—to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake—to honour the king. Here was an assumption of the sovereign power in issuing a command to all the realm; and of the archiepiscopal, in ordaining matters purely spiritual, not only without the sanction of the powers of the church and state, but in direct defiance of their united authority. This spirit of disobedience has ever subsisted in Scotland from that time to the present hour, in every different phase of its ecclesiastical constitution; and which arose partly from the democratical nature and origin of the reformation, and the mixture of the lay elements in it; the last of which was prompted by the *root of all evil—covetousness*, and by the opposition of the papal bishops to those salutary reforms which they themselves confessed to be absolutely necessary.

The above ordonnance was readily obeyed in all those districts where the congregational lords had patriarchal authority; and in pursuance of it the Earl of Argyle made Mr. Douglass preach publicly in his house. The clergy were indignant at this assumed authority, and made pressing remonstrances to the regent, who answered, that it was then inexpedient to interfere, but when the fitting time should arrive she would take order with the reformers. It was necessary to keep on good terms with the lords of the congregation till she had accomplished the marriage of her daughter, which was the grand object of all her intrigues. But in truth her authority was almost nominal, for the power of the nobility overshadowed the crown; and, in fact, she was unable to protect the established clergy. This was conspicuous in their conduct this same year, in flatly refusing to invade the realm of England, and each nobleman withdrawing from the army which she had

[1] Keith, p. 66.—Knox, 135.

collected for that purpose. "And now," says Balfour. "*begins* the hatred of the nobility and gentry against the queen regent, which for a long time had lurked amongst the ashes of discontent to burst forth in a flame." But this was not all; for "the parliament, adjourned till the 14th day of December this year, sits down at Edinburgh, wherein, after the heavy complaints of the queen regent were heard, and they *in a manner slighted*, and some few laws for procedure in civil business before the (court of) session were enacted, the parliament *without more ado broke up*[1];" that is, without waiting to be dissolved by the regent's authority, but broke up of their own motion.

1558.—Disappointed in that support which he not unreasonably expected from the crown, and seeing that it would be impossible to prosecute those priests and preachers whom the nobility had taken under their especial protection by the title of domestic chaplains, the archbishop wrote a dignified but conciliatory letter to the Earl of Argyle. After giving the earl his most hearty commendations, he reminded him of the antiquity, the illustrious achievements, and the many honourable ramifications, of his noble house, and assured him of his own affection. He then appealed to him on all these considerations to discharge that "man-sworn apostate (Douglass) who, under the pretence that he giveth himself forth as a preacher of the gospel and verity, under that colour, setting forth schisms and divisions in the holy church of God with heretical propositions; thinking . . . . . to infect this country with heresy." He shewed his lordship "that there is a dilation of that man called Douglass of sundry articles of heresy, which lieth to my charge and conscience to put remedy to; or else all the pestilential doctrine he sows, and also all that are corrupted by his doctrine, and all that he draweth from our faith and christian religion, will lie to my charge before God[2]." As lord justice-general of the kingdom it would have been Argyle's province to have carried the vengeance of the church into effect on *the heretics;* and therefore the archbishop reproached him for being too remiss in his high office. But the earl pointed the primate's attention to heresies of another and more flagrant sort, which it would well become, he said, his "honour and conscience" to inquire into and reform. He replied that Douglass preached against *idolatry*, which he remitted to his grace's *conscience* whether or not it was heresy—against *adultery* and *fornication*—against

[1] Annals, i. 308. [2] Knox's History, pp. 135, 135.

hypocrisy—and against all manner of *abuses* and *corruptions* of Christ's sincere religion; all of which he referred to the primate's *conscience*. These reproofs were too stinging and too notoriously true to be well relished[1].

It was now evident, from the policy of the regent, and the bold defiance of the nobility, that the Church would not be supported by the secular arm, on which it had so long securely rested; the archbishop, therefore, unhappily determined to proceed on his own authority, and an opportunity soon presented itself. During Cardinal Beaton's progress through the county of Angus, a charge of heresy had been preferred against Walter Mill, parish priest of Lunan in that county; but at that time he made his escape. He had lurked in different parts of the kingdom, and preached sometimes privately and at other times publicly, but had altogether escaped the notice of the ecclesiastical authorities. He was discovered by some of the officers of the archbishop's court at Dysart, in the county of Fife, by whom he was hurried to St. Andrews, and brought to trial as a heretic. Heresy, according to Peter Dens, is "the unbelief of those who profess, indeed, that Christ has come, but who reject his doctrine in any part, *as proposed by the Church* 'of Rome,' such as Lutherans, Calvinists," &c. And the same infallible authority shows, that "heretics, apostates, and schismatics, can be *compelled, by corporal punishments*, to return to the Roman faith; and incorrigible heretics, (that is, *Protestants*,) are to be punished with excommunication—by being rendered *ipso jure* infamous, by having their temporal goods confiscated, and *justly punished with death*[2]."

The Reverend Walter Mill was an old man aged eighty-two, so much worn out and emaciated, that it was not expected that he could have made himself heard in court. He was tried by the archbishop and several of his suffragans; and at the bar he spoke with great courage and composure, to the amazement of the court. He was condemned to be burnt alive for heresy; which, in his case, consisted chiefly in asserting the lawfulness of the marriage of the priests, denying that there are seven sacraments, and alleging that the mass is idolatrous. No temporal judge, however, could be persuaded to pronounce the sentence; the chief magistrate of the city positively refused: nor would any one sell a piece of rope to pinion the aged martyr. For this reason his sentence of condemnation was postponed till the next day, when the

[1] Knox's Hist. 137, and Keith. [2] Dens' Theology, vol. ii. pp. 88, 89.

archbishop was obliged to elevate one of his own domestic servants to the rank of a temporal judge, and who pronounced sentence accordingly. Cords had to be brought from the archiepiscopal palace to bind their victim, and the archbishop's domestic presided at the execution. At the stake he addressed the sympathising crowd:—"The cause why I suffer this day is not for any crime, (though I acknowledge myself a miserable sinner,) but only for the defence of the truth of Jesus Christ; and I praise God, who hath called me by his mercy to seal the truth with my life, which, as I have received of him, so I willingly offer it to his glory. Therefore, as ye would escape eternal death, be no more seduced with the lies of the seat of Antichrist, but depend only on Jesus Christ and his mercy, that you may be delivered from condemnation." He also added, that "he trusted to be the last who should suffer death in this land upon such an account." He expired amidst the merciless flames, in front of the main gate of the priory, on the 28th of April, and with him it may be said that the Roman Church in Scotland also expired; for the extreme old age and decrepitude of this venerable martyr so roused the sympathies of the people with his sufferings, that they began to unite in bonds and subscriptions to support each other in matters of religion, and to take up arms in self-defence against the exterminating cruelty and oppression of the Roman hierarchy. The people were so touched with pity for his cruel death that they raised a *cairn*, or pile of stones, on the place where he drew his last breath amidst the flames, and which they renewed several times after it had been thrown down by order of the clergy; who at last set a watch to apprehend those who should thus show their respect for the memory of this aged martyr[1].

The clergy were now sensible of the alienation of popular respect, and of the decay of their affairs, and they did not venture again to attempt a capital punishment. The archbishop held a synod this year in the month of July; but so dejected were the clergy at the prospects of the Church, that they could only formally condemn some who were accused of heresy, to make a public recantation at the market-cross on the 1st of September, which was St. Giles's day; but who showed their contempt for their authority by non-appearance. It is needless to say that those who refused to attend the synod paid as little respect to their sentence of reading their recan-

[1] Spottiswood, 95—97. Rev. C. J. Lyon's Hist. of St. Andrews, p. 99. Keith's Hist. b. i. c. vi. pp. 67, 68.

tation. St. Giles being the tutelar saint of the city of Edinburgh, it was determined to make a solemn procession with his image through the streets of the city; but which was an ill-judged experiment on the temper of the people, in the present irritable state of their minds. To add greater solemnity to this absurd ceremonial, the queen-regent determined to honour it with her presence. Some one had stolen the real image, and it was necessary to procure some other idol to represent the saint. After accompanying it for some way the queen with her attendants withdrew; and then the people attacked the clergy, seized their idol, and trampled it under their feet. They "dismounted the image, brake off his head against the stones, scattered all the company, pulled the priests' surplices over their ears, beat down their crosses, and, in a word, so discomposed the order of that mock solemnity, that happy was the man who could first save himself in some house or other." Balfour places this synod on the 1st September, but this discrepance may arise from the procession happening on that day. "On the 1st September," he says, "this year, the Roman clergy kept a synod at Edinburgh; the first day of the sitting down of which the priests had a solemn procession, wherein they carried a great log of wood or idol, by them called St. Giles. The commons and others who favoured the gospel make a great tumult, and soundly beat all the priests of Baal, and brake all their idol St. Giles in pieces[1]. The priests fled for shelter, and the magistrates quelled the uproar. Thinking to strike terror into their enemies, the clergy summoned a solemn meeting, to be held in Edinburgh on the 7th of November, to which they indicted Paul Methuen, the lay preacher. He, however, did not appear; and sentence of banishment from the realm was therefore denounced against him, and a severe punishment against any one who should harbour or assist him with any of the necessaries of life. The inhabitants of Dundee were not intimidated by this commination, but still continued to maintain him, and attend on his preaching, and petitioned the regent, though unsuccessfully, for a reversal of his sentence[2].

Acting under the influence of the Romish clergy and her French councillors by whom she was surrounded, the queen regent entirely disregarded the petitions of the congregation for a reformation of the church. By the number of subscriptions from all parts of the country, which was returned

[1] Heylin's Hist. of the Presbyterians, p. 126. Annals, i. 310.
[2] Keith, b. i. c. vii. 69.

to the lords of the congregation, these "sticklers for reformation, *such as it was*," clearly saw that the majority of the people was on their side, and consequently that upon a probable trial of strength they would have a decided advantage. The lords of the congregation had sent agents through the kingdom to solicit the subscriptions of those who were friendly to a reformation, and unwilling to be oppressed by a party who were found to be inferior in point of numbers. And, says Keith, "these succeeded so well in their circuits, that some being moved with zeal to religion, others out of a desire of change, and the *greater part* longing to be relieved from the oppression of the clergy, were easily moved to consent to what was proposed; by which means the chief leaders, perceiving their party was become considerable, and their numbers not inferior to their adversaries, they then first assumed the name and title of the CONGREGATION, which became much more famous afterwards by the multitudes of those who joined them[1]."

Many of the ministers and professors of the gospel returned this year from Germany and Geneva, and the nobility and gentry consulted with them how to abolish the popal church and expel the French. James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, Read, Bishop of Orkney, with several noblemen, and Erskine of Dun, were sent to France to witness the queen's marriage with the dauphin, in Notre-Dame, by the Archbishop of Rouen. The Bishop of Orkney, the Earls of Rothes and Cassillis, and the Lord Fleming, died so suddenly at Dieppe on their return, as to leave little room to doubt of their having been poisoned. In September, the Bishop of Brechin and Andrew Durie, bishop of Galloway, died. To the former, Donald Campbell of the family of Argyle succeeded, but *without* consecration; to the latter, Alexander Gordon, called Archbishop of Athens, but whether or not he ever had canonical consecration it is now almost impossible to ascertain. On the 1st of October, Panter, Bishop of Ross, died of a lingering disease at Stirling. He had been a principal secretary of state and privy councillor, and had also been employed as ambassador at the court of France. He was a man of supereminent abilities, but of loose morals. Mary, queen of England, died also on the 5th of December, and was succeeded by Elizabeth, her half sister. On the 9th of December the queen regent assembled a parliament, and proposed that the queen's consort, during his marriage, should be allowed the

[1] Keith, b. i. c. 7, 68, 69.

title of king, and that the style should be Francis and Mary, king and queen of the Scots; which, after some caviats and restrictions, was allowed, and the Earl of Argyle, James Prior of St. Andrews, and the Lyon king at arms, with two heralds, were sent to France to crown Francis with all solemnity [1].

Although the church, under the dominion of the see of Rome, lingered out a sickly existence for some years after the martyrdom of Walter Mill, yet that event may be said to have given it its death-blow, for it never after enjoyed the affection or respect of the great body of the people. It is to be deplored that both the court and the hierarchy were decidedly opposed to any reformation of the church, and that in consequence the lay nobility and ignorant people took upon themselves to set the house of God in order. Had Cardinal Beaton employed his eminent talents and influence, or his more amiable successor taken up the duty of reformation, which repeated synods of their own clergy declared had become absolutely necessary, all the disorders and unhappy divisions which have since flowed like a torrent might have been prevented. But for the sins of the nation, which were great, for it was fearfully polluted with blood, and it wallowed in the utmost uncleanness, it was otherwise ordered in the councils of divine Providence. As the prophet complained of old of the Jewish priesthood, so might it have been said of the Scoto-Romish clergy. "Both prophet and priest are *profane*; in my house have I found their wickedness, saith the Lord,"—"for from the least of them even unto the greatest of them every one is given to *covetousness*: and from the prophet even unto the priest every one dealeth falsely [2]." Synods called for the special purpose of acknowledging the sins and abominations of the sacerdotal orders, had shewn to the world that adultery, fornication, and all the works of the flesh, stood proclaimed as their own peculiar and besetting sins. Still, with the admission of their own guilt, such was the moral degradation into which they had fallen, that no steps were taken for redeeming the time. A few canons were enacted for the separation of the priests from their adulterous concubinage and from their illegitimate families; but nothing was done to cleanse the Augean stable. But it cannot be otherwise; the *celibacy*, as it is surely in mockery called, of the Roman clergy, is in the solemn denunciation of holy writ *a doctrine of devils*. Hence that flood of immorality which has overspread the whole papal world, but which seems to have been deeper

[1] Balfour's Annals, i. 311—13. [2] Jerem. xxiii. 11; vi. 13.

and more indelible in Scotland than any where else. "For the sins of her prophets, and the iniquities of her priests that have shed the blood of the just in the midst of her; they have wandered as blind men in the streets, they have polluted themselves with blood, so that men could not touch their garments[1]."

It has long been the crying sin of the Romish church to prohibit the laity from reading God's holy word, which was written for our learning, and was given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. At the very first spring of an attempt at reformation, the earnest desire of all parties was to have permission to read the Old and New Testaments in the vulgar tongue. Notwithstanding a most powerful opposition by the spiritual estate, the parliament removed all impediments and penalties from the free circulation of the blessed Scripture, and copies were imported from England. There the Bible was translated under Henry's auspices in 1526, and some other editions appeared down to the year 1539, when Cranmer's great bible was published, and which had been revised and superintended by that illustrious martyr. Thus, by the good providence of God, a translation of the Scriptures found its way among our early inquirers after truth, at a time when, although the stern prohibition was removed, yet there was not a native translation in existence. No circumstance tended more than this to stimulate men to extricate themselves from that spiritual darkness in which they and their fathers had been involved by their worse than Egyptian task-masters of the Romish church. Perhaps two more powerful examples of their degeneracy from the light of revelation cannot be produced, than of a bishop of the Scoto-papal church, in rebuking an inferior clergyman, thanking God that he himself had *never* read either the Old or the New Testament! and a reverend synod of the church authorising the Lord's Prayer to be addressed to saints!

The "Congregation," or the united body of the Protestants, preferred the use of the English Liturgy, and made it one of their canons that it should be used on all Sundays and holidays; and we have seen that a grave charge of heresy was preferred against Sir John Borthwick because he used and recommended the English liturgy. At that time it was the Common Prayer first set forth by Edward VI. which they used, and which Bishop Jolly calls "a pattern of the most judicious, moderate, and wise reformation;" and likewise it was

[1] Lament. iv. 13, 14.

the *identical liturgy* which the Presbyterians afterwards rejected with contumely in the reign of Charles I. It differed in a few particulars from the present English liturgy, which had been altered in order to please the vitiated taste of some intermeddling foreigners; but it is substantially the same. By this inimitable liturgy the early Scottish reformers had the inestimable advantage of worshipping God in the vernacular tongue, and of praying with the understanding; and they were relieved from the tyranny of being compelled to commit the enormous sin of idolatry, by praying to the Virgin and dead men in a language which they did not understand. Neither had they at that time the intolerable bondage imposed upon them of listening to oblique sermons delivered extemporarily, under the pretext of prayers, which has since been riveted on the necks of their descendants.

At the outset of the reformation, the principal actors were of the inferior clergy, whose motives were good, and who never contemplated any other than episcopal government; but on the prospect of clutching the extensive and fertile lands of the church and monastic bodies, the clergy were joined by the lay nobility, who were actuated by the worst possible motives—*the root of all evil*, COVETOUSNESS. In a conversation between the Earl of Arran and Sir Ralph Sadler, in the year 1543, the former said, "That though he desired no less the reformation of the *abuses* of the church, and the extirpation of the estate of monks and friars, with the abolition of the Bishop of Rome's usurped authority, than that the king (Henry) did; yet he owned that that would be a hard matter to bring to pass, for, said he, there be so many great men in the kingdom that are papists, that *unless the sin of* COVETOUSNESS *bring them into it* (that is, the desire of having the lands of the abbeys in their own possession), he knew *no other means to win them to his purpose* in that behalf." The reformation in Scotland was, as Archbishop Spottiswood justly observes, "violent and disordered," originating in the vices and crimes of the papal clergy, which roused the contempt and abhorrence of the religious part of the nation, and excited the avarice and ambition of the leading men, on whose hearts true religion had not shed its benign and self-denying influence. The cruel measures into which the heads of the papal church were precipitated by that insane thirst of blood which has always characterised it, tended greatly to disgust the minds of the people, and which eventually settled down into a principle of abhorrence against every thing which is in the remotest degree connected with popery. Although such a horrifying

spectacle cannot be shewn in Scotland, as *thirteen men and women* expiring amidst the excruciating agonies of the flames, as at Stratford-le-Bow, yet many glorified God by that satanical mode of killing his disciples (who in this are not to be greater than their Lord) which the church of Rome, in her delusion, thinks is doing God service. The cruel deaths which have been inflicted by the church of Rome upon those who have opposed her errors, are *marks* by which she is made as visible as the mystic Babylon itself, which is seated on seven hills. Those who have suffered under her cruel persecutions are more than can be numbered, and the nature and circumstances of their deaths have been monstrous; but this does not mark her out as the chaste spouse of Christ, but for "that woman that is drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." This *scarlet* and bloody mark, however unwilling she may be to admit it, is so indelibly burnt in, so deeply branded upon her, that it can never be washed out. But the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church; and those terrible acts of cruelty of which that church was guilty, with the view of striking terror into the minds of the people and subduing their consciences, only excited a more fervent spirit of inquiry, and aroused their resentment. Cardinal Beaton and his brethren exulted in the execution of Wishart, and thought they had given heresy its death-blow; but, says Archbishop Spottiswood, this murder "proved the very rock on which he and all his fortunes perished."

The perusal of the Scriptures permitted the well-disposed to see the fearful denunciations which they contain throughout, against the *idolatry* which is approved, authorized, and practised, in the papal church. It now became evident to them that, in point of fact, the papal worship chiefly consisted in the most senseless idolatry; both priests and people were as much given over to that most dreadful sin as the Israelites were to the worship of Baal. There is no essential difference betwixt praying to the Virgin Mary, as, "O sweet Lady of mercy, turn your merciful eyes unto me, enlighten me with grace, and hear my prayers; unto . . . . . your holy hands, O refuge of sinners, I recommend my soul and body,"—and calling on the name of Baal from morning even until noon, saying, "O Baal, hear us!" We cannot, therefore, wonder at the reaction which took place in men's minds, nor at the violent

[1] The Poor Man's Manual of Devotion, or the Devout Christian's Daily Companion, 1822, permissu superiorum, pp. 53, 54; 1 Kings, xviii. 26.

language by which they characterized the enormities from which they themselves had escaped, and which were obstinately retained by the papal church. They had a practical knowledge of papal corruptions, they had felt them in all their unmitigated atrocity—the iron had entered into their souls: hence the vehemence of their language, and the fierceness of most of their actions. A reformation was thus rendered absolutely necessary; and had not idolatry of another sort usurped the place of the papal idolatry, there is no doubt but that the church would have reformed herself, and, as in England, have retained all the essentials of a church and expelled only the pope's supremacy, the worship of images and relics, and the other corruptions of the papal system. And God, even our own God, would have sat as a refiner and purifier of silver; and He would have purified the sons of Levi, and have purged them as gold and silver, that they might have offered unto the Lord an offering in righteousness—spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ[1]. But unhappily, from there being no king in our Israel at that time, the equally damnable idolatry of *covetousness* entered in, and took possession of the hearts of the nobility and gentry, who, for their own selfish purposes, excited the people to be reformers, or rather destroyers, of the church. Professing the utmost zeal for the honour of God, their whole practice was robbery and spoliation, both of the lands and tithes of the church. And they brought the curse of God upon the whole nation, who, for their most dreadful idolatry of covetousness, suffered the hedges of the church to be broken down, so that all they that passed by plucked her, the boar out of the wood wasted it, and the wild beast out of the field devoured it[2]. As their fathers went away from God's ordinances by the worship of stocks and stones, and the exaltation of the ever blessed Virgin into the mediatorial office of the one Mediator, the man Christ Jesus, our Lord and our God, so the spoliators of that day changed the matter but not the nature of their idolatry, and so incurred the curse which has adhered to their posterity even to this day. But how, it will be asked? I answer, with the prophet:—"Even from the days of your fathers ye are gone away from mine ordinances and have not kept them. . . . . Will a man rob God? Yet *ye have robbed me.* But ye say, wherein have we robbed thee? *In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation.*" To escape this dreadful anathema, which is too surely written

[1] Malachi, iii. 3; 1 Pet. ii. 5. [2] Psalm lxxx. 13.

against us, let us hearken unto his gracious words as announced by the same prophet: "Return unto me, *and I will return unto you*, saith the Lord of Hosts. But ye said, wherein shall we return? ..... Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now therewith, saith the Lord of Hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it. And I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes, and he shall not destroy the fruits of your ground; neither shall your vine cast her fruit before the time in the field, saith the Lord of Hosts. And all nations shall call you blessed: for ye shall be a delightsome land, saith the Lord of Hosts[1]."

[1] Malachi, iii. 6—13.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PRIMACY OF ARCHBISHOP HAMILTON.

The Lords of the Congregation order the liturgy to be used.—Knox's account of the first "face of a church."—Demands of the Lords of the Congregation.—Petition to parliament—and protest.—A provincial synod.—Petition of the protestants.—Answer of the synod.—The ministers summoned to appear at Stirling.—Regent's breach of faith.—Arrival of Knox at Perth—His sermon, and its effects.—Riot in the church—Altar demolished.—Destruction and plunder of monasteries.—Brief reflections—The regent's indignation.—Letters.—Knox preaches in Fife.—Demolition of the cathedral and monastic buildings in St. Andrews.—French troops put in motion.—Perth taken.—Scoon burnt.—Desolating march of the congregation at Stirling;—Linlithgow;—Edinburgh.—Destruction of churches.—Alarm of the regent—Her measures.—Insolence of the French soldiers.—Death of Henry II.—Arrival of French troops, and preparations for civil war.—Deposition of the regent—Her active measures.—Elizabeth assists the protestants—Sends troops.—Regent removes to Edinburgh Castle—Her death, and character.—Siege of Leith.—A treaty.—Elizabeth's policy.—Position and prospects of the Roman church.—Meeting of the estates.—Spiritual estate threatened with death.—Acts of this parliament.—Sandilands sent to France.—Confession of faith—Remarks on it.—Distribution of ministers.—Superintendents.—Scarcity of ministers.

1558.—The Congregation having now determined on entirely separating from the Roman communion, the "Lords of the Congregation," as the leading lay protestants were called, issued their commands to all the realm, without waiting for the royal assent, to use the liturgy of Edward VI., and to keep the festivals of the church as therein directed; "but they said that preaching or interpretation of Scriptures should only be practised in private houses after a quiet manner, till God should please to move the queen to grant further liberty." This order is an ample proof that the first protestants had no intention of introducing, far less of practising, the extemporary mode of worship which has since been adopted. The Romish clergy, who still held the parish churches, complained loudly to the regent of this bold assumption of ecclesiastical supremacy, and solicited her protection. For political reasons she was disposed to temporise with the protestants, and therefore replied, that it was not a fit time to enter into these matters, but that at a convenient season she would take order with them[1].

[1] Spottiswood.—Knox.

The Congregation resolved, in right earnest, to complete their work; yet, that they might not seem to contemn or oppose themselves to lawful authority, they determined to present a petition to the queen regent in council, "to whom, (the petition bears) the redress of all enormities, both ecclesiastical and civil, did orderly belong." This is a decided proof that Presbytery was not then thought of, for it absolutely denies the power of the sovereign to interfere in ecclesiastical affairs. But here, on the threshold of the reformation, we are startled at the lay platform on which it is formed, by the candid avowal of the author of Knox's History. After stating all that we have already said, he unsuspiciously adds:—"And this our weak beginning God did so bless, that within a few months the hearts of many were so strengthened that we sought to have the *face of a church* among us, and open crimes to be punished without respect to persons; and for that purpose, by common election were elders appointed to whom the whole brethren promised obedience; for at that time *we had no public ministers of the word*, only did certain zealous men (amongst whom was the laird of Dun, David Forrest, Mr. Robert Lockhart, Mr. Robert Hamilton, William Harlaw, and others) exhort their brethren according to the gifts and graces granted unto them. But shortly after, God stirred up his servant Paul Methuen (his latter fall, namely, adultery, of which he was twice convicted and deposed, ought not to deface the work of God in him), who in boldness of spirit began openly to preach Christ Jesus in Dundee, in divers parts of Angus, and in Fife; and so did God work with him, that many began openly to renounce their old idolatry, and to submit themselves to Christ Jesus and unto his blessed ordinances; insomuch that the town of Dundee began *to erect the face of a public church reformed*, in the which the word was openly preached, and *Christ's sacraments* TRULY *administered*[1]," by a mere layman and an immoral man. Indeed, with the exception of Harley, whose ordination is somewhat doubtful, all those named above were laymen.

Confidence in their numbers prompted the lords to petition the regent, menacing her, however, covertly, with open rebellion and a civil war, in the event of her refusing the prayer of their petition. Contrary both to law and to fact they denominated themselves "a part of that power which God hath established in this realm;" and at the same time most inconsistently, and certainly anti-presbyterianly, acknowledged,—

[1] Knox's Hist. p. 104.

"We, knowing *no order* placed in this realm but your majesty and your grace's council, set to amend, as well the disorder ecclesiastical as the defaults in the temporal regiment." Here the first Protestants are utterly *opposed* to the opinions which the non-intrusion Presbyterians of the present day solemnly declare to be the *mind of Christ*. Some other points in their petition, which follow, will also be found to involve doctrines which are abhorred as soul-destroying heresies by some modern Protestants.

The Lords of the Congregation made the following demands:—

"*First*, Humbly we ask, that as we have, by the laws of this realm, after long debate, obtained to read the holy books of the Old and New Testament in our vulgar tongue, as spiritual food to our souls, so from henceforth it may be lawful that we may meet publicly or privately *to our common prayers* in our vulgar tongue, to the end that we may increase and grow in knowledge, and be induced, by fervent and oft prayers, to commend to God the holy universal Church, the queen our sovereign, her honourable and gracious husband, the ability of their succession, your majesty regent, the nobility, and whole state of the realm.

"*Secondly*, If it shall happen in our said meetings any hard place of Scripture to be read . . . . that it shall be lawful for any persons in knowledge, being present, to interpret and open up the said hard places, to God's glory and to the profit of the auditory; and if any think that this liberty should be the occasion of confusion, debate, or heresy, we are content that it be provided, that the said interpretation shall underly the judgment of the godly and most learned within the realm at this time.

"*Thirdly*, That the holy sacrament of baptism may be used in the vulgar tongue, that the *godfathers* and witnesses may not only understand the points of the league and contract made betwixt them and the infant, but also that the church there assembled more gravely may be informed and instructed of their duties, which at all times they owe to God, according to that promise made unto him when *they were received into His household by the* LAVER *of spiritual* REGENERATION.

"*Fourthly*, We desire that the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or of *his blessed body and blood*, may likewise be ministered unto us in the vulgar tongue, and in both kinds, according to the plain institution of our Saviour Christ Jesus.

"And, *lastly*, We most humbly require, that the wicked, slanderous, and detestable lives of prelates, and of the state ecclesiastical, may be reformed, that the people by them have not occasion, (as of many days they have had,) to contemn their ministry and the preaching, whereof they should be messengers: and if they suspect that we, rather envying their honours, or courting their riches and possessions, than zealously desiring their amendment and salvation, do travel and labour for this reformation, we are content that not only the rules and precepts of the New Testament, but *also the writings of the ancient Fathers, and the godly and approved laws of Justinian the Emperor, decide the controversy betwixt us and them.* And if it shall be found that, either malevolently or ignorantly, we ask more than these three fore-named have required, and continually do require, of able and true ministers in Christ's Church, we refuse not correction, as your majesty with right judgement shall think meet; but if all the fore-named shall condemn that which we condemn, and approve that which we require, then we most earnestly beseech your majesty that, notwithstanding the long custom which they have had to live as they list, that they be compelled either to desist from ecclesiastical administration, or to discharge their duties as becometh true ministers; so that the *grave and godly face of the primitive Church* (may be) restored, ignorance may be expelled, true doctrine and good manners may once again appear in the Church of this realm. These things we, as most obedient subjects of your majesty, in the name of the eternal God, and of his Son Christ Jesus, in presence of whose throne judicial ye, and all others that here in earth bear authority, shall give account of your temporal government. The Spirit of the Lord Jesus move your majesty's heart to justice and equity."

"Here," says Bishop Sage, in commenting on this document, "our reformers lay down a complex rule, according to which they crave the Church and the ecclesiastical state may be reformed. This complex rule is made up of the rules and precepts of the New Testament, the writings of the ancient Fathers, and the godly and approved laws of the Emperor Justinian. This is that solid, orthodox, proper and adequate rule of reformation which I mentioned before, as Vincentius Lirinensis his rule[1], and the rule wherein our reformers *agreed*

[1] "*Magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est. Hoc est enim vere proprieque catholicum.*" We

with the English reformers. By this rule *our* reformers are *content* that all the controversies betwixt them and the Papists be decided. They refuse not correction, if they ask more than *this rule requires;* they condemn no more than *this rule condemns; this rule approves* all they are asking. In short, they require no more than that, according to this rule, the *grave and godly face of the primitive Church may be restored*, as it was in Justinian's time. Let the ecclesiastical state be reduced to that frame and constitution, and the clergy live, and rule, and discharge their trusts and offices as the clergy did then, and they are satisfied. And now if these reformers, who thus petitioned, and in their petition thus reasoned and agreed to such a rule of reformation, were for the divine institution of parity and the sacred rights of presbytery; nay, if they were not only for the lawfulness but *the continuance* of prelacy, I must confess my ignorance to be very gross, and so I refuse not correction[1]."

Sir James Sandilands of Calder, and a Knight of Rhodes, was deputed to present the above petition, which was very displeasing to the regent: but she dissembled her sentiments, on account of her anxiety to secure the matrimonial crown for the Dauphin. She answered, therefore, generally, "that all that they should *lawfully* desire should be granted unto them. Meanwhile, she licensed them to use their prayers and service in the vulgar language, discharging them from keeping public assemblies in Leith or Edinburgh[2]." The Romish bishops, who were then holding a synod, were much incensed at the queen's acquiescence; and, when the petition was presented to them, and their consent was required, "they carried themselves more imperiously than before, and avouched their determination not to depart a jot from the decrees of the Council of Trent[3]."

The Congregation, still preserving their orderly and respectful bearing, again petitioned parliament, "that in regard the controversies in religion between the Protestant and Roman Churches were not yet decided by a lawful general council, and that they themselves, upon the same grounds, could not any longer communicate with Papists in their idolatrous religion, the humble desire of the Congregation was, that all such acts of parliament as warranted churchmen to proceed against heretics might be abrogated, or at least suspended, till, in a lawful general council, the controversies depending were deter-

must take care, above all things, to adhere to that which has been believed in all places, at all times, and by all persons: for this is truly and properly catholic.

[1] The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, pp. 116, 117.

[2] Spottiswood. [3] Ibid.

mined." The regent answered this petition to the same effect as before; which rather increased the fears of the Protestants of some designed treachery, and they protested therefore, among other things, "that seeing we cannot obtain just reformation according to God's word, that it may be lawful for us to use ourselves in matters of religion and conscience as we must answer unto God, until such time as our adversaries be able to prove themselves the true ministers of Christ's Church, and purge themselves of such crimes as we have already laid to their charge, offering ourselves to prove the same, whensoever the *sacred authority* shall please to give us audience. And, lastly, we protest, that these our requests, proceeding from conscience, *do tend to no other end but only to the reformation of abuses in religion;* most humbly beseeching the sacred authority to think of us as faithful and obedient subjects, and take us in their protection, keeping that indifferency that becometh *God's lieutenants* to use towards those that, in his name, do call for defence against cruel oppressors and blood-thirsty tyrants[1]."

From this protest it would appear, that our first reformers had not learned the modern doctrine that all power is derived from the people; for here they expressly call the sovereign the "*sacred authority*," and "*God's lieutenant*:" neither had they as yet declared war against the fundamentals of religion, which they tacitly acknowledge the Church of Rome to retain, but only against "*abuses in religion*." In this point they exactly coincided with the English reformers, with whom they were in full communion, who have never destroyed the fundamentals, but only reformed the "*abuses in religion*." But it could not be otherwise; as the Marian persecution had driven many of the English clergy to seek refuge in Scotland, where they tended greatly to foster and preserve the reformed doctrines, as well as to preserve that friendly and charitable feeling which existed between the national churches in the beginning of the Reformation.

Robert Reid bishop of Orkney, and one of the commissioners who were sent to witness the marriage of Queen Mary, died at Dieppe, the 14th September, not without suspicion of poison. He was a most learned and munificent prelate, and an able politician. He bequeathed 8000 marks for founding the College of Edinburgh, of which the Earl of Morton afterwards robbed it. He was president of the Court of Session, and abbot of Beaulieu, in France, and of Kinloss, in the county of

[1] Spottiswood.—Knox.—Keith.

Moray. In the month of August, John Hepburn, bishop of Brechin, died, to whom Donald Campbell, of the family of Argyle, and who was abbot of Couper, succeeded. He never was consecrated; for, Bishop Leslie says, on account of his favouring the reformation, his election was displeasing to the Court of Rome, and therefore he never took the title of bishop, but was called abbot, and sat as such in the convention of 1560. On the 1st of October, David Panter, bishop of Ross, died at Stirling, of a lingering illness; whom, Keith says, "was a person of most polite education and excellent parts." He was consecrated at Linlithgow, it may be concluded by Archbishop Hamilton, who was then holding a provincial synod. Keith gives him an excellent character; but Balfour says, "At this time dies James Stewart, eldest base son to James V., abbot of Kelso and Melrose; and, to accompany him in death whom he so dearly loved in his lifetime, dies also that *notable adulterer*, David Panter, bishop of Ross, some time secretary to the regent, James, Duke of Castelherault, Earl of Arran[1]." In September, also, Andrew Durie, bishop of Galloway, died, and was succeeded in that see by Alexander Gordon, who had perhaps been consecrated abroad, as he is designated *Archbishop of Athens*.

1559.—A provincial synod was again convoked in the month of March, and to which the regent presented by the hands of the Earl of Huntly another petition from the Congregation, in which they justly say, as they had before said in their petition to parliament, "that, without extreme danger to our souls, *we may in no wise communicate with the damnable idolatry* and the intolerable abuses of the papistical church[2]." And they petitioned that the bishops should be chosen by the gentry of their diocese, and the inferior clergy by the people of their parishes. After a long debate the synod replied that they could not dispense with the Latin language in the public prayers; that in the election of bishops the canon law ought to be maintained entire; to determine otherwise during the queen's minority would be a treasonable encroachment upon the royal prerogative, seeing the election of bishops was a privilege of the crown which required only the consent of the people. And finally, the other points of the petition were referred to the decrees of the Council of Trent[3]. The answer of the synod, as given by Bishop Leslie, is, "That it was not

[1] Balfour's Annals, i. 311—313; Keith's Catalogue. [2] Knox, b. ii. 119.
[3] Keith, b. i. c. viii. p. 83.—Knox.

reasonable they should alter the method of electing bishops and presbyters prescribed by the canon law, especially in the time of the queen's non-age: her prerogative was interested in the matter: she with the pope's consent had power to nominate the prelates; and to take that power out of her hands without her consent, and before she came to perfect age, was notoriously as well as undutifully to invade her royalty[1]." Balfour says:—"In the beginning of the year 1559 the clergy keep a solemn synod at Edinburgh, to advise anent the most assured props they could to uphold their tottering hierarchy; to them the professors of the gospel gave in some articles, whereat the bishops and clergy fumed and raged: but instead of answering them, they published a number of articles, indeed blasphemies, against Christ, his evangel and professors of the same. They likewise in this synod make some feckless acts for reformation of their idle-bellied monks and adulterous clergy, which moved divers churchmen at this time to embrace the gospel[2]."

Hitherto the queen regent had borne her faculties meekly towards the reformers, but since the dissolution of parliament her carriage towards them had much altered. She summoned John Knox, John Willock, John Douglass, and some other preachers, to appear before her, and the council; but on their refusing they were denounced rebels. She registered the names of all the reformed ministers, and summoned them to appear at Stirling on the 10th May; whereupon the Earl of Glencairn and Sir Hugh Campbell, sheriff of Ayr, humbly entreated her majesty "not to molest or trouble the ministers, unless they should act disorderly, or preach false doctrine." The queen, who had been secretly instigated, replied in heat, "that, maugre their hearts, and all that take part with them, these ministers should be banished Scotland, though they preached as soundly as ever St. Paul did." The same day the queen received information that the attack on the church which was called reformation had begun in Perth; and, sending for Lord Ruthven, the provost of that town, she commanded him to go and suppress these innovations; but his lordship excused himself, as having no power over men's consciences. The 10th of May approaching, the Reformers from all parts of the country determined on accompanying their preachers to the place of trial. They assembled in vast multitudes, which alarmed the queen, who accordingly sent for

[1] Leslie de Rebus Gestis Scotorum, 504. [2] Balfour's Annals, i. 313.

Mr. Erskine of Dun, to negociate with them to return peaceably to their homes, promising that the indictment against the ministers should be discharged, and all further proceedings to their prejudice dropped. The Congregation sent Mr. Erskine of Dun to the queen regent, humbly to entreat her majesty that she would be pleased to recal that rigid decree against Knox and the others; but which she peremptorily refused to do. Knox, seeing that the regent was determined to support the papal church, "*incited the people* to abolishing of the pope's authority, and the down-pulling of monasteries and religious houses, by him called the nests and craigs of unclean birds[1]." The leading men having some suspicions of the queen's sincerity, sent the commonalty to their homes, but remained themselves quietly at Perth. The execrable maxim of the papal church, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, was here enforced. On the 10th of May, the preachers, relying on the royal promise, did not appear, and they were denounced rebels, which so incensed and disgusted Mr. Erskine, that he withdrew from court, and joined the Congregation at Perth, and showed them that in giving advice to disperse he had himself been deceived by the regent; he therefore recommended them to provide against the worst, as they might expect no favour[2]. The people were now actuated by a daring spirit of sedition; and the sword was appealed to by both parties as the only arbiter of their irreconcileable differences. The ancient hierarchy was on the eve of its dissolution; whilst every day was adding to the numbers and the power of the Congregation.

At this critical juncture, when the minds of the reformers were irritated with the recent perfidy of the queen's advisers, John Knox arrived in compliance with the urgent but selfish invitation of the lords of the Congregation. He arrived at Leith on the 2d of May, while the episcopal synod was still sitting in Edinburgh. He remained only two days in Edinburgh, but proceeded to Dundee, and joined the multitudes, as Bishop Keith says, "in the *nick of time*," who were hurrying to Perth, which he found crowded with protestants who were exasperated to the utmost pitch against the government and the papal clergy. Mr. Erskine admonished the people, that as they had now been declared rebels they were therefore exposed to the penalties of high treason, and their lives and property were in the utmost peril; and he also shewed them that they had only one of two alternatives before them; either to

[1] Balfour's Annals, i. 314. [2] Spottiswood.—Keith.—Knox.

submit to the regent unconditionally, or to draw the sword in defiance of their lives, liberty, and religion.

On Thursday, the 11th, Knox unceremoniously took possession of the noble church of St. John, which was already completely filled by his friends, except in those divisions of its spacious aisles which were occupied as altars and shrines of saints. "Within the little sanctuaries many a churchman now stood, looking with no benignant eye on the crowds who occupied the steps, or pressed irreverently against the balustrades, which they until now were wont to approach with bended knee. Within the pale of the altar a number of the priests stood in a line in front, clothed in their gorgeous vestments, as if to overawe the multitude by the splendour with which the altar and its attendants were adorned, but they looked in vain for the homage of the once subservient crowd." The pulpit stood at the west end of the choir against one of the centre pillars which supported the tower, into which Knox without permission entered, and without more ceremony commenced his sermon. Unfortunately, *preaching* has always from the commencement been the chief note of the Scottish reformation; while prayers have been always considered of secondary importance. But it has been said that a preaching church will never stand. He was accompanied and supported by the lords of the Congregation, who took their seats at the foot of the pulpit stairs. He expatiated on the present state of the church, and the prospects of the Congregation; but his chief subject of declamation and invective was the gross and unblushing idolatry maintained and practised in the papal church, especially in the mass or eucharistic service. He also denounced the adoration of images and pictures, and showed truly that they tended to the dishonour of God, and were a breach of the second commandment, which saith, *thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them;* and that wherever they were erected in churches they ought to be pulled down and destroyed. "With the energy of the preacher the attention of the assembly awoke; every eye was fixed upon him; every word seemed to find its way to their bosoms; calling up the most marked expressions of enthusiasm and approbation from the great mass of the crowd, and stern defiance among the priests, whom the fervour of his address brought by degrees out of the lateral recesses, and who were now seen peering from among the protecting balustrades. From contrasting the present with the past state of the church, he proceeded to hurl against her the sublime denunciations of the Old Testament prophets against Babylon,

confirming them with the anathemas against her spiritual antitype, from the Revelations; and as he quoted the passage in which an angel is represented as casting down a great millstone, and pronouncing—'thus with violence shall Babylon be thrown down;' the pulpit seemed to yield with the almost frantic energy by which he was agitated. Had he ceased at that moment, the enthusiastic feelings of the auditory were so wound up that nothing could have withheld them from executing literally on the monuments around them the predictions of the prophets. But gradually subsiding from this enthusiastic tone, he addressed himself to his hearers, and closed by exhorting them *to put away the unclean thing* from among them. So rapt were the audience, that Knox withdrew from the church with the attendant noblemen almost unobserved, and for some time afterwards the people stood as if expecting the preacher again to appear amongst them[1]."

The sermon being ended, and the more respectable part of the auditory gone to dinner, an infatuated priest, as if in contempt of the vehement declamation of the ardent preacher, began to make preparations for celebrating mass in the same church. He uncovered the tabernacle on the altar, when the images and other appendages of the Romish worship were exposed to the view of the rabble, who were irritated and roused almost to madness by the infuriating eloquence of Knox's sermon. A boy exclaimed, "Shall we stand by, and see idolatry practised in defiance of God's word?" The priest, offended at his rudeness, exclaimed "Blasphemer!" and struck the youth, who in turn threw a stone, which missed the priest, but hit an image on the altar, and broke it. This set fire to the train, and stimulated the ferocious passions of the "*rascal multitude*," as John Knox justly calls them, who immediately followed up the boy's attack by an assault on the altar, and completely demolished it with all its images and sacred utensils. They next proceeded to demolish all the decent ornaments of the church, the priests themselves escaping the fury of the rabble with the utmost difficulty. The sacrilegious zeal and fury of the rascal multitude within the church spread like wild fire amongst the rabble without; and after having demolished all the sacred furniture of this splendid church, they ran violently to attack the religious houses with which Perth abounded. The towers and minarets of the monasteries

[1] Murray's Sketches of Scenes in Scotland, taken from a manuscript of Principal Tullideph of St. Andrews, which he obtained from a lady, a descendant of the principal, cited in Lawson's Rom. Catholic Church in Scotland, p. 191.

of the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Carmelites, rose proudly in the "Fair City," and rivalled each other in splendour; while the Charter House, founded by James I. in 1429, was more like the palace of a sovereign prince than the residence of *mendicant* friars. The prior of the latter establishment had garrisoned his house with the tenants of the lands belonging to it, and made a feeble defence; but the "rascal multitude" broke open the gates with one of their own crosses, which were set up for veneration outside their gate. All these, with a number of chapels and nunneries, were demolished, plundered, and rendered tenantless in an incredibly short space of time. The "rascal multitude" substituted the "root of all evil" for the idolatry of the papal church, and to sacrilege added the sin of robbery; for they plundered the abbeys of money, provisions, and rich furniture, with which they were amply filled. In a few hours these beautiful and costly edifices were completely gutted, and nothing of them left standing but the bare walls[1]. How different is this reforming zeal from the conduct of the apostles and primitive christians against the idolatry that prevailed in their age. It was by faith and the use of spiritual weapons alone that they subdued the nations; and it was by the holiness of their doctrine, the blamelessness of their lives, and the greatness of their sufferings and self-denial, that they conquered the kingdom of darkness and of idolatry. The apostles did not march out to reform the world with malignity and hatred in their hearts, the torch of sedition and conflagration in their hands, and the carnal weapon by their side; but *by faith* they subdued kingdoms, and taught submission to the powers that be.

The author of the history ascribed to Knox, seems conscious of the criminality of his hero with the "rascal multitude," which he had stimulated and encouraged to this wanton and unlawful destruction of the churches and monasteries. He attempts to gloss over the abominable transaction by saying, that this work of destruction was not done by "gentlemen, nor by those who were earnest professors, but by *the rascal multitude;* who finding nothing to do in that church, did run without deliberation to the Grey and Blackfriars." Nevertheless, this infamous transaction must be altogether laid to Knox's charge, for it was done under his own eye, while he stood quietly looking on, and when his commands or exhortations might have prevented the whole riot; but as he did not forbid the fury of the "rascal multitude,"—"the madness

[1] Spottiswood.—Knox.—Keith.—M'Crie's Life of Knox.

of the people,"—his silence was a tacit encouragement. But this is not all; we have his indirect acknowledgment of his own share in the riot; for, says he, "*So beaten were men's consciences with the Word*, that they had no respect for their own particular profit, but only to abolish idolatry, the places and monuments thereof, to wit, the Black and Grey thieves." In nearly the same words Buchanan lays the weight of the whole transaction on the preacher; for, says he, "matters standing in this ticklish posture, *Knox assembled the multitude at Perth*, and made such an excellent sermon to them, *that he set their minds all in a flame*." Subsequent events are a sufficient warrant for our accusing Knox of the guilt of this riot and destruction of property, as it was only the commencement of a system, which, with the aid of "the rascal multitude,"—"the beasts of the people" according to the Psalmist,—he carried on with exterminating vigour, in defiance of the laws of his country, having been stimulated, not more by religious feeling and antipathy against the idolatry of the mass, than by the sin of covetousness, in his followers. The plunder of the abbeys and monasteries, where the whole wealth of the nation was concentrated, served to inflame the zeal and whet the appetite of the "rascal multitude" for plunder. These reformers erected a monument for John, more durable than brass, in every quarter of the kingdom where religious houses were situated. Almost all the cathedrals and elegant churches and monastic buildings were dedicated to the same end, as may be seen to this day, their ruins reminding the religious man of the glories of this world which pass away, and the antiquary of the taste, grandeur, and piety of antiquity.

After reforming the church and enriching themselves with the spoils, "the rascal multitude" departed to their own homes, and left John Knox at Perth "to instruct the people, because *they were yet young and rude in Christ*." Thus, in one hour, it may be said, did judgment come upon her who "glorified herself and lived deliciously," and said in her heart, "*I sit a queen*, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow." But the light of her candle, which had long burnt dim, shone no more at all in the Scoto-papal church; the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride was doomed to be heard no more at all in her; for her merchants were the great men of the land who had been deceived by her sorceries, but now were resolved to devour her flesh. "And in her were found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain

upon the earth[1]." Although a just judgment now overtook this most degenerate and corrupt church, yet the truth of our Lord's words, in another sense, must be admitted,—woe be to them by whom the judgment was inflicted.

When these rascally proceedings were reported to the regent, she was so indignant that she vowed utterly to raze the town of Perth, and salt it with salt, in token of perpetual desolation. In her present temper and that of the popish party, she would have carried her threat into execution, had she not been deterred by the appearance of the Earl of Glencairne, with some other noblemen, at the head of two thousand five hundred of their armed followers. After some time spent in negociation, the regent took possession of Perth on condition of respecting life and property; but when the forces of the Protestants were disbanded, she began to disregard the conditions. The Lord James Stuart and the Earl of Argyle, who had hitherto been amongst the number of her supporters, remonstrated with her on this infraction of the treaty; but her answer not conveying that assurance of good faith which they expected, they deserted her service and went over to the Protestants. This was the *ostensible* cause of their sudden change; but the rich and extensive lands which were now passing from the grasp of the churchmen had a most persuasive influence on their pious affections.

The ferocious example of the inhabitants of Perth was quickly imitated by the "rascal multitudes" in other places. At Cupar, in Fife, the people attacked the parish church, demolished the altar, the rich paintings, and the fine tracery of the pillars, which the poor curate took so much to heart that he committed suicide the following day.

Knox felt it prudent to leave a scene where he had played so conspicuous a part, and one which was likely to be visited with the royal displeasure: he therefore took his departure, in company with the Earl of Argyle and the Lord James, for St. Andrews. Before leaving Perth, however, they addressed letters to the regent, to the nobility, and to the clergy under the rude and uncharitable title of "the generation of Antichrist, the pestilent prelates and their shavelings within Scotland." The contents of the last letter corresponded to the unmannerly address. It commences with a menace of retaliation for the blood which they had shed:—"To the end that ye shall not be abused, thinking to escape just punishment after that ye, in your blind fury, have caused the blood of many to

[1] Revelations, ch. xviii. xix. *passim*.

be shed, this we notify and declare unto you, that if ye proceed in this your malicious cruelty ye shall be dealt withal, wheresoever ye shall be apprehended, as murderers and open enemies to God and unto mankind . . . . . or else, be assured, that with the same measure that ye have measured against us, and yet intend to measure to others, it shall be measured unto you; that is, as ye by tyranny intend not only to destroy our bodies, but also by the same to hold our souls in bondage of the devil, subject to idolatry, so shall we, with all the force and power which God shall grant unto us, *execute just vengeance and punishment upon you.*" In their letter to the queen, they threaten to call in foreign assistance, if she persisted in maintaining the popish clergy in their persecuting severities, and in the support of idolatry. In their address to the nobility, the hand of the Jesuit is clearly to be seen in the distinction which they are pleased to draw betwixt *authority* and the *persons* of those who are placed in authority. This is that unchristian position which the Covenanters at a later period adopted and improved, and on which they acted in their rebellion against Charles I. The letter-writer, who was most likely Knox himself, says, "Do ye not understand that there is *a great difference* betwixt the *authority* which is God's ordinance and the *persons of those* who are placed in authority?" How is it possible to disunite what God hath joined together? how is it possible to be subject to an authority where there is no executor? The powers that be, as well as the authority with which they are invested, are ordained of God, and every soul is commanded, on pain of damnation, to be subject to the powers who are God's ministers, to bear the sword with all authority. This furnished the Protestants with an apology for their seditious and ungovernable conduct, and taught them to make the jesuitical pretence of resisting the person but maintaining the authority of the sovereign, while they were acting contrary to all law and authority.

We are told by Knox's biographer, that the Lords of the Congregation determined, in the beginning of June, to make a bold and vigorous effort to shake off their "chains altogether;" that is, they had sufficiently humbled the "person who was placed in authority," and felt themselves strong enough, in the support of the "rascal multitude," to assume the power of imposing a religious creed upon the nation. "The scandalous lives of the established clergy," he too truly says,—"their total neglect of the religious instruction of the people—and the profanation of religious worship by gross idolatry—were the most glaring abuses. The Lords of the Congregation resolved to

take immediate steps for removing these, by *abolishing the Popish service, and setting up the reformed worship* in all those places to which their authority and influence extended, and in which the greater part of the inhabitants were friendly to the design. This step," he adds, "is *justified* in part by the feudal ideas respecting the jurisdiction of the nobility, which at that time prevailed in Scotland[1]."

But whatever jurisdiction they possessed over the tenants on their own estates and personal retainers, they could have no jurisdiction over the citizens and free burgesses of the corporate towns and cities; still less had a few nobles and preachers authority to alter the fundamental laws of the kingdom with the view of furthering their own private interests. In prosecution of their designs, they fixed on St. Andrews for commencing their operations; and Knox agreed to meet the Earl of Argyle and the Lord James in that city.

On the 9th of June, Knox preached a sermon at Crail, in Fife; and the following day he also preached against the idolatry of the mass at Anstruther, which was as usual followed by an assault of the "rascal multitude" on the altars, with their decorations and images, in the parish churches of these places. From thence he proceeded to St. Andrews, where the archbishop, hearing of their desecrating pilgrimage, and fearing a similar *reformation* in his own city, placed in it a "hundred spears, with about a dozen culverins," for its protection. Seeing this, the Lords and the reforming rabble wished to dissuade Knox from preaching; but he, nothing afraid, boldly ascended the pulpit, and significantly harangued the audience on the ejection of the buyers and sellers from the temple. He so powerfully wrought on his hearers, "the provost and baillies, with the commonalty," and fired their holy zeal for reformation, that they proceeded immediately to pull down and destroy the splendid cathedral, with the other churches, rasing the monasteries of the Black and Grey Friars to the ground, and destroying all the monuments of antiquity within the city, adding pillage to their sacrilege. "They not only demolished," says Mr. Lyon[2], "in whole or in part, the monasteries of the Black and Grey Friars, the priory[3], the provostry of Kirkheugh, and the ancient church of St. Regulus, but the *splendid cathedral*—the metropolitan church of Scotland for so many centuries—the scene of so many interesting events—the tomb of so many prelates, all of them eminent for their rank or their

[1] M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 163. [2] History of St. Andrews, p. 104.
[3] The Lord James, natural son of James V., was prior of this priory.

learning, and most of them for their piety and virtue." This barbarous exploit was executed on Sunday afternoon, under the personal superintendence of our Reformer, who pretended to find a warrant in our Saviour's purgation of the temple[1]. Knox is to be entirely condemned, in thus letting loose "all the unsettled humours of the land—rash, inconsiderate, fiery voluntaries,"—and "stirring them to blood and strife;" to destroy, with ruthless barbarism, all those noble churches, which had been consecrated to the service of God, and venerable for their antiquity and the grandeur of their architectural ornaments, even although they had been polluted with the worship of crucifixes and mediatory saints. Our blessed Lord had an undoubted right to turn out the money-changers; and they were so well satisfied of his right, that they neither complained nor resisted: but John Knox could plead no such right—we read of no divine commission conferred on him. He very evidently showed, that in hounding on "the rascal multitude" to the sacrilegious work of destroying the temples of God, he "*knew not what spirit he was of*[2]."

The archbishop made his escape to Falkland, and, joining the queen, gave her the first intimation of the ferocious reformation which was proceeding with such ungovernable fury. She promptly set her French troops in motion, on whom alone she could rely, and issued a proclamation, summoning the native subjects to meet the next day at Cupar. Immense crowds flocked to the standard of the Reformation, which was now unfurled in open rebellion. The queen intended to have tried the issue of a battle, but her native troops became mutinous, and refused to fight against their countrymen; whereupon she was obliged to patch up an insincere peace—the Duke of Chatelherault, her nominal commander, stipulating, that the insurgents should first leave the field, to save the honour of the sovereign[3].

The queen had placed a garrison in Perth, in violation of the treaty with the Lords of the Congregation, and which the reformers, now flushed with their appearance of strength, determined to expel; they marched on that place accordingly, carrying fire, sword, and sedition, in their train. The garrison evacuated the town, and Lord Ruthven was reinstated in his

[1] Knox; Keith, b. i. c. viii. p. 90; Heylin. lib. iv. p. 130; Spottis. p. 146.

[2] Of this most horrid sacrilege Dr. M'Crie says, "A great part of the nation demanded *such* a reformation; and, had not *regular measures* been adopted for its introduction, the popular indignation would have effected the work in a *more exceptionable way!*"—P. 163.

[3] Spottiswood; Balfour's Annals, i. 316.

civic dignity, from which he had been degraded by the regent. The following day the "rascals" commenced their work of reformation; when they plundered and burnt to ashes the royal palace and abbey of Scoon. Some noblemen exerted themselves to preserve the chapel, but to no purpose. Knox himself hypocritically attempted to dissuade them, but here he found that it was much easier to raise a devil than to lay him. Patrick Hepburn, bishop of Moray, and who was also commendator of the abbey of Scoon, with some military retainers, occupied the palace, which is about three miles distant from Perth. The Lords wrote to him, desiring he would join and assist them, which he promised to do; but his answer not reaching them in time, the rabble marched to the assault. Knox, and some of the lords, attempted to dissuade their auxiliaries from demolishing this stately edifice, but without effect. "When the flames were ascending, an old woman, perceiving that many persons were offended thereat, said, 'Now I see and understand that God's judgments are just, and that no man is able to save where he will punish. Since my remembrance, this place has been nothing else but a den of whoremongers. It is incredible to believe how many wives have been adulterated, and virgins deflowered, by the filthy beasts which have been fostered in this den; but especially by that wicked man who is called the bishop[1].'"

A suspicion arising that the regent intended to seize and garrison Stirling with French troops, and to fortify the bridge to prevent their passage of the Forth, the Earl of Argyle and the Lord James left Perth at midnight, and, on their arrival at Stirling next morning, roused the fanaticism of the reformers in that town, devoted all the churches to destruction, desecrated the altars and holy vessels, and demolished all the trumpery of images. The monasteries in the town and neighbourhood, but especially the venerable Abbey of Cambuskenneth, experienced the tender mercies of the ferocious reformers,—these they rased to the ground, and utterly destroyed them. The work of reformation occupied these *lights* of the world in their generation three days. On the fourth they marched tumultuously on Edinburgh, committing their usual havoc by the way, desecrating the churches, burning, pillaging, and destroying the monasteries, especially at Linlithgow, "and there demolish and pull down all whatsoever carried any symbol of the Roman whore[2]." The

[1] Keith's Hist. b. i. c. viii. p. 93; Knox's Hist. b. ii. p. 164—166.
[2] Balfour's Annals, i. 317.

terrified inmates carried the report of the desolating industry of the reformers to the queen regent at Holyrood House. "The Congregation from Linlithgow march they to Edinburgh, and the queen regent deals earnestly with the citizens of Edinburgh to oppose their entry, which they altogether refuse. The queen hearing their answer, and fearing they would lay hold on her person, she, with D'Ossel and her French soldiers, retire to Dunbar Castle. Then enters the congregation Edinburgh, and there removes and demolishes all badges of popery and superstition out of the realm, and return the French soldiers home again who had for many years so miserably oppressed the country since their first footing here, without any respect of persons or fear of divine justice[1]." The queen, alarmed at this open defiance of her authority, and ignorant of their force, which had been much exaggerated, though it did not exceed three hundred men, retired with her whole court to Dunbar, carrying the Lord Seaton, the provost, with her, and leaving Edinburgh a prey to the unrestrained licence of the fanatical reformers, or, as Knox, in imitation of Judas Iscariot, said, "left the spoil to *the poor*, who had made havock of all such things as were moveable in those places before our coming, and left nothing but bare walls; yea, not so much as door or window." On the removal of wholesome restraint, the country reformers were joined by the rabble of Edinburgh, the most riotous in the kingdom; and in the fury of their barbarous zeal, they plundered, desecrated, and demolished all the monasteries and religious houses in the city, carried off all that was portable, and consigned the rest to the fire. The chapel royal did not escape the "rascal" visitation: the costly communion plate was confiscated for the common use of the sovereign people; the superb paintings and valuable ornaments were visited here, as elsewhere, with the besom of reforming destruction. But their leaders flew at higher game, and seized on the mint, the peculiar attribute of sovereignty; on which the queen regent, recovering from her panic, issued a proclamation, in which she offered to call a parliament for establishing order in matters of religion, alleging, "That they of the Congregation, rejecting all reasonable offers, had, by their actions, clearly showed that it is not religion, nor any thing pertaining thereto, that they seek, *but only the subversion of authority, and the usurpation of the crown.*" She commanded all strangers to depart from the city within six hours, "except

[1] Balfour's Annals, i. 317.

they would be reputed and holden as manifest traitors to our crown[1]."

A rumour had prevailed, and was circulated with activity, that the lords of the congregation had entered into a treasonable conspiracy to deprive the queen regent of her authority, and to disinherit the Duke of Chatelherault and his heirs of the eventual right of succession to the crown; which, to the honour of many of the inferior members of the congregation, induced them to withdraw from a society holding such treasonable views. To exculpate themselves, and undeceive the world, the leaders addressed a letter to the regent, and issued a proclamation to the people, stating that such "an imputation was most false and odious; their intentions being none other but to abolish idolatry and superstitious abuses, that did not agree with the word of God, and maintain the true preachers thereof from the violence of wicked men." The queen offered a safe conduct to a deputation which was sent to assure her of the loyalty and good intentions of the Congregation; and graciously assured them, "that, if she could be assured of their honest and dutiful meaning towards her daughter and herself, their demands seemed not unreasonable," and desired earnestly that the Earl of Argyle and the Lord James should wait on her. But, conscious of their own treasonable conduct, and fearing treachery on her part, others were sent, when articles were agreed to, that the Congregation should deliver up the palace of Holyrood House and the mint; and remaining true and obedient subjects of the queen, and of the regent as her representative, should depart from Edinburgh within twenty-four hours. The regent on her part promised that she would not interfere with the reformed preachers, nor prevent their celebration of divine worship in their own way, (which was by the Book of Common Prayer set forth by Edward VI. of England), till the 10th of January following; and, being left to her own good disposition, she kept this promise inviolate. But the French officers insolently interrupted the Protestants at their public devotions, by creating great disturbances in the churches; "and at Leith," says Spottiswood, "they cut in pieces the pulpit erected for the preachers, and set up the mass, which had been suppressed before in that town. They did the like in the abbey church, forcibly abolishing *the service of the common prayers, which then was ordinarily used*[2]." The same was used in St. Giles's

[1] Spottiswood.—Knox.—Keith.
[2] Spottiswood.—Knox.—Keith.—M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 172.

Church, Edinburgh; and when the congregation departed from the city, they left John Willock, a priest of the Church of England, to officiate in it. Knox retired with the lords of the congregation to Stirling; and afterwards undertook a preaching tour through the southern counties, and stirred up the inhabitants to pull down and deface the strongholds of idolatry[1].

The death of Henry II. king of France, which took place on the 8th of July, had a considerable influence on the affairs of Scotland. Henry had conceived a just suspicion of the designs of the Lord James on the crown, and sent Mr. Melville to ascertain his views, and the exact position of the Protestant party; but before Melville could return, the crown had descended to his son, Francis II. and the Queen of the Scots. These dismissed the Duke of Montmorency from their councils, and gave themselves up entirely to the direction of the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorrain, the queen's uncles and brothers of the Scottish regent. They sent a Monsieur de la Croc to acquaint the queen regent that a reinforcement should be sent under the command of her brother the Marquis d'Elbeuf, and about a thousand men, commanded by one Octavian, very soon afterwards arrived. At the same time Francis sent despatches to the Lord James, menacing him with the vengeance of the crown of France for his acts of sedition and treason. A few more French troops followed, and the queen fortified Leith, and threw a strong French garrison into it. The Congregation seized and fortified Broughty Castle in the Tay, and the lords of the Congregation made vigorous preparations for war. They summoned the regent to surrender Leith, and demanded the instant dismissal of the French forces. This was so far from being conceded, or of intimidating the regent, that she forthwith sent the Lyon King-at-Arms to command them to withdraw their forces from Edinburgh and disband them, on pain of treason[2]. The Congregation now began to look to England for military assistance against the French troops. Knox accordingly urged Kirkcaldy of Grange to apply to Sir Henry Percy, warden of the English marches; and he himself wrote to Cecil, urging him to support the Congregation against the regent and the French forces[3]. In the meantime, the regent openly accused the Duke of Chatel-

[1] M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 172.
[2] Keith, b. i. ch. ix. 101-103: Heylin, b. iv. 133.
[3] M'Crie's Life of Knox, 174-5.

herault of the design of usurping the crown; but that nobleman and his son, the Earl of Arran, "purged themselves by sound of trumpet, at the cross of Edinburgh," on the 19th of October, of all treasonable views.

The lords of the Congregation retained the Lyon King-at-Arms till after they had held a solemn "gathering of the nobles, barons, and burghers of their faction within the Tolbooth (or common jail) of the city, on the 21st of October." The Lord Ruthven was called to the chair, and after he had opened the business of the meeting, and declared that the reasons of their present meeting was, because the queen regent "pursued the barons and burgesses within the realm with weapons and armour as strangers, without any process or order of law, laid garrisons in towns which oppressed the lieges, and forced a great part of the inhabitants to flee out of their own houses, till they were restored by arms, and provosts thrust baillies upon burghers without form of election, brought in strangers, and placed them in one of the principal parts of the realm; committed the Great Seal to a stranger, without consent of the council, and sent the Great Seal forth of the realm by the said stranger; that she will not join with them to consult upon the affairs of the commonwealth, they being born councillors of the same by the ancient laws of the realm; and intended to suppress the liberties of the commonwealth[1]." As a consequence of this case, which they made to suit the exigency of the moment, the lords of the Congregation, without any warrant from their sovereign, took upon them, in her name and by her authority, as they said, to depose the queen regent, and deprive her of her power as regent. This daring act of rebellion, however, was not done without some opposition, and it was thought necessary to consult Willock and Knox, who produced several examples of the same sort from Scripture, but which, when examined, had no reference to the present question. The mischievous and unchristian doctrine of the sovereignty of the people was here first practically broached; yet they had not reached that boldness which has since been gloried in. At the very time when they were acting on the most determined democratical principles, they still maintained the divine and fundamental derivation of kingly power; for Willock, in delivering his opinion, said, "Albeit *magistracy be God's ordinance*, and they who bear rule, *have their authority from him*;" and, "*albeit God has appointed magistrates his lieutenants on earth, honouring them*

[1] Calderwood's True History, p. 12.

with his own title, and calling them gods," &c. The casuistry, however, of these two reformers was all that was wanted to give the lords of the Congregation a plausible excuse for the daring act of rebellion on which they had determined, of depriving the queen dowager of her delegated power. They did not meet in parliament to give such an act the semblance of legality, but in a convocation of the leading men in the common jail of the city. They, however, assumed to themselves that authority of which they had illegally deprived the lawful regent, and ordained their resolutions to be published at the market crosses of all the principal burghs of the kingdom. This act was subscribed "by the nobility and commons of the Protestant church of Scotland:—That we, in the name of our sovereign lord and lady, do suspend your commission." After due intimation of this revolution at the market cross, with all the usual legal formalities, the royal herald was dismissed to give the queen due intimation, and to command her to yield up the fort of Leith; but in place of which the French garrison in that town made a sally, and twice defeated the Congregational forces; on which they abandoned Edinburgh, and retired to Stirling, "where master Knox had a comfortable sermon[1]."

In this treasonable act the lords of the Congregation ground their whole procedure upon the fact of their being hereditary councillors of the crown. But they convened together in arms in the first place, in open defiance of the authority of their sovereign, as administered by her mother; and, in the second place, they met and transacted an important step as councillors, without even the knowledge, much less the authority, of the sovereign. They declared that to be the sovereign's will which they had the best assurance was not her will; and they set up, in her stead, a council of regency, consisting of twelve noblemen who doubtless were hereditary councillors, and also of eldest sons of peers, lairds, and provosts of different cities, who certainly were not hereditary councillors of the realm. They here carried out Knox's principle of distinguishing betwixt the person and the authority of the government, suspended the lawful representative of their sovereign without her knowledge or consent, and set up a regency composed of men of several ranks, who were, says Bishop Keith, "the great and constant sticklers for an alteration in religion." We are, however, informed, towards the conclusion of the treasonable declaration of the lords, on what foundation they had ventured on so

[1] Keith, 105; Calderwood, p. 12.

remarkable a step as the suspension of the regent's authority—"and now the duke and the rest of the nobility, with the barons and burgesses of the realm, were in the end constrained to constitute a council for the governance of the realm to the use of their sovereign lady; and therewith humbly to signify to her the *reasonable suspension* of the dowager's authority; which, to *maintain*, they have taken on themselves as natural subjects[1]."

Defiance was now mutually given, but the sinews of war were wanting in the coffers of the Congregation; but as they were in communion with the Church of England, and that country was their place of refuge, they applied to Sir Ralph Sadler for money to carry on the war, and especially for the capture of Leith, which the queen had strongly fortified, and garrisoned with French troops. The queen had the advantage of the Congregation,—recovered possession of Edinburgh,—set up the mass in St. Giles's, which the Bishop of Amiens *consecrated*, to purge it from the contagion of heresy,—and sent pressing entreaties to the court of France for a reinforcement of troops, with which she was furnished. Willock fled to England[2]. As it is not my intention to notice the history of the times, farther than the church is concerned, I pass over the military events, only stating, generally, that as Elizabeth, from policy, was at the head of the Protestant interest, she made common cause with the Congregation, entered into a solemn treaty with them at Berwick, and liberally assisted them with men and money, and "all such things as made for the good and conjunction of the two kingdoms, and particularly for expelling the French out of the realm of Scotland."

1560.—The Congregation sent Maitland of Lethington to London in the end of the last year, and who concluded a treaty with Elizabeth on the 27th of February, by which she engaged to send an army into Scotland to assist in the expulsion of the French forces. Accordingly she sent the Lord Gray with 2000 horse and 6000 foot, to support the lords of the Congregation. Alarmed at this invasion, the queen regent took shelter in Edinburgh Castle, commanded by the Lord Erskine, "a nobleman of approved honesty and wisdom," where she became, in a manner, his prisoner. The lords of the Congregation addressed a respectful letter to her, entreating that she would send the French forces out of the kingdom; but receiving no satisfactory answer, hostilities

[1] Keith, b. i. c. 9. 106-7. [2] Spottiswood.—Knox.—Keith.

commenced. While the lords of the Congregation and their English allies were vigorously besieging the town of Leith, and a civil war, occasioned by religious animosity, was raging furiously, the queen regent died, worn out with the cares and anxieties of her government.

This illustrious princess was possessed of uncommon talents for affairs, and the greatest courage and prudence; she was at the same time of a gentle and humane disposition, and was always inclined to temper justice with mercy; but she lived at a period of unusual turbulence and insubordination. She ruled with delegated authority a rude and semi-barbarous people, rendered disloyal and seditious by the republican principles disseminated by Knox, who inculcated the maxims of the Greek and Roman democracies, rather than that just subordination which is due to sovereign princes, whose authority, an inspired apostle assures us, "is of God." Nevertheless, "she bore her faculties so meekly," and with such magnanimity, that even Knox, her bitter enemy, is compelled to confess her abilities, although he reviles her memory in the most indecent manner[1]. Had there not been a secret influence behind the throne, which distracted her councils, and prevented her from following the dictates of her own heart, there cannot be a doubt but that the Scottish reformation would have been consummated, as it happily was in England, without subverting the foundations of the church, and breaking the apostolic succession. In her last conference with her nobles she accused her French councillors and her instructions from the French court, with the evil advice of the Earl of Huntly, who was a bigoted papist, for much of the insincerity with which her government had been marked. Her courage was great, but not unaccompanied by that tenderness of heart peculiar to her sex. She invariably headed her troops, sharing in common with them the fatigues and privations incident to a military campaign. In the cabinet she evinced great dexterity and address; and her breaches of faith with the Congregation, which exasperated and irritated them, must be ascribed altogether to

[1] Camden says, "she was a pious and wise princess, who had suffered the most bitter reproaches from some virulent and bitter preachers,"—of whom, adds Bishop Keith, "the principal was Mr. Knox, who has all along treated this queen in a set of language peculiar indeed to himself, but too much below either a gentleman or a divine to utter." At the conclusion of one of Knox's usual tirades against her and her family, the bishop adds, "*what enthusiasm, venom, scurrility, and indecency!* Bad qualities in a reformer! much room left for reformation at home. The blessed apostles converted the world by a better spirit."

the influence of her French and priestly councillors, to whom she was devoted, and who instigated her to acts of severity and perfidy, and not to her own natural disposition. In the only instance in which she was suffered to follow the dictates of her own heart, she kept faith with the Congregation,—whom, be it remembered, she was *taught to consider as heretics, with whom no faith should be kept*,—with the most honourable scrupulosity. She was often heard to say, that if her own council might take place, she doubted not of being able to compose all the dissentions within the realm, and to settle the same in perfect tranquillity and a lasting peace upon good and solid conditions. And Archbishop Spottiswood says, in the MS. copy of his history, "these things I have heard my father often affirm, whose testimony deserved credit, and have many times received the like from an honourable and religious lady, who had the honour to wait near her person, and often professed to me that the queen regent was much wronged in John Knox his story[1]." Her death was much lamented, not only by her own party and personal friends, but by many of those who were opposed to her religion and government, and were in arms against her. Knox and the other Protestant preachers vehemently and indecently prevented the celebration of her funeral obsequies according to the papal rites; and it was therefore necessary to enclose her body in lead. She was kept in the castle till the 19th of October following, when her uncharitable enemies permitted her remains to be conveyed to France, where they were interred with royal honours at Rheims, in the Benedictine monastery of St. Peter, of which her sister was the abbess.

Spottiswood says of her, "before her death she desired to speak with the Duke of Chatelherault, the Earls of Argyle, Glencairn, and Marischal, also the Lord James; to whom she expressed her grief for the troubles of the realm, commending earnestly the study of peace, advising them to send both French and English out of the country, and beseeching them to continue in obedience to the queen their sovereign, and to entertain the old amity with the king and realm of France. After some speeches to this purpose, bursting forth in tears, she asked pardon of them all whom in any ways she had offended, professing that she did forgive them who had injured her in any sort, and embracing all the nobles, one by one, kissing them, she took her farewell. To the others of a meaner sort that stood by, she gave her hand; so they departed. Afterwards,

[1] Appendix to Bishop Keith's History, p. 89.

disposing herself for another world, she sent for John Willock, the preacher, who was then returned from England, and conferring with him a reasonable space, *openly confessed* that she did trust *only to be saved by the death and merits of Jesus Christ;* and thus ended her life most christianly. She was a lady of honourable conditions, of singular judgment, and full of humanity, a great lover of justice; helpful to the poor, especially to those that she knew to be indigent but ashamed to beg; compassionate of women in travail, whom she did often visit in her own person, and help both with her skill and counsel. In her court, she kept a wonderful gravity, tolerating no licentiousness; her maids were always busied in some virtuous exercise, and to them she was an ensample every way of modesty, chastity, and the best virtues. The author of the story ascribed to John Knox, in his whole discourse, showeth *a bitter and hateful spite* against her, *forging* dishonest things, which were never so much as suspected by any, setting down *his own conjectures as certain truths*, and *misinterpreting* all her words and actions; yea, the least syllable that did escape her in passion, he maketh it an argument of her cruel and inhuman disposition[1]."

The death of the regent did not alter the position of the conflicting parties. The whole kingdom, from one end to the other, was plunged into anarchy and confusion, and which was aggravated by religious animosity and the bigoted prejudices of both the great religious parties. The siege of Leith was vigorously pressed, and the garrison reduced to the last extremity. A treaty was, however, at last concluded between the French king and Mary with her subjects, when the siege was raised, and the fortifications levelled with the ground. On the 16th of July, the English army began their retreat for the evacuation of the kingdom, and most of the protestant nobility conveyed them some miles on their route, but the Lord James accompanied them as far as to Berwick. On the 19th, a solemn thanksgiving was held by the preachers in St. Giles's church for the pacification of the kingdom and the triumph of the Protestant cause[2].

This treaty, entered into in name of their respective sovereigns by the French and English ambassadors, consisted of seventeen articles, and provided for the removal of the French troops in English ships. The ninth article of the treaty is of some importance: it provided, "that the estates of the realm

[1] Spottiswood.—Keith's History.—Balfour's Annals, i. 320—325.
[2] Keith, b. i. c. xii. 115.

should convene and hold a parliament in the month of August next, for which a commission should be sent from the French king and the queen of Scotland, and that the *said convention should be as lawful in all respects* as if the same had been ordained by the express commandment of their majesties; providing all tumults of war be discharged, and they who ought by their places to be present may come without fear." The tenth article ordained, that the administration of the government should be entrusted to "twelve worthy men." The kingdom had been for some time entirely without any government: the lords of the Congregation having usurped the authority, and governed not only without any commission, but in direct contrariety to their sovereign. Lastly, "that the queen of the Scots and the king of France should not hereafter usurp the titles of England and Ireland, but should delete the arms of England and Ireland out of their scutcheons and whole household stuff[1]."

On the death of Mary Tudor, the queen of the Scots was unhappily induced, by French advice, to lay claim to the crown of England, as being the next in proximity of blood; and accordingly she assumed the arms and title of queen of England. This claim was founded upon Elizabeth's supposed illegitimacy; but the pope *offered* to acknowledge the legitimacy of her birth, provided she would submit to his supremacy!—so much does self-aggrandisement bias these pious heads of the Church! Mary's title was undoubted, Elizabeth's was questionable; and, therefore, the latter laid the most solid foundation for preserving her throne by throwing herself into the arms of the Protestants. Those of England she was secured of for their own safety; her next policy was to secure those of Scotland: she therefore employed some private instruments to ascertain their sentiments. On the first intimation of her friendly feeling towards them, the Congregation showed the utmost alacrity in uniting their interests with hers. They immediately addressed her, begged her protection, and plighted their faith that they would depend on her, and stand by her, and to the utmost of their power support her, and secure her throne. She, on her part, supported the Reformation in Scotland both with troops and money. The treaty at Leith was principally conducted by her councils and her ambassadors. It was the hopes of her assistance which induced the Earl of Argyle and the Lord James, bastard son of the late king, to decline going to France to present the crown matrimonial to the dauphin, although they had before under-

[1] Spottiswood.

taken to do it. Their views were now altered; and they conceived the hope of support from the Protestant queen,—that "bright occidental star," as she has been called,—and they were not deceived[1].

The minds and affections of the great majority of the people were now entirely alienated from the papal church, but which was still recognised as the national establishment, although its power and influence had been for some time departed—its glory was gone. Many of the papal clergy were secretly favourable to the reformation of religion; but the author of the Life of Knox says, that in general they were "too corrupt to think of reforming their manners, too illiterate to be capable of defending their errors; they placed their forlorn hope on the success of the French arms, and looked forward to the issue of the war as involving the establishment or the ruin of their religion[2].

The article of religion had been left undecided in the late treaty, and therefore it was the chief subject to be settled when the parliament met. In it the Protestant party were the most powerful, and exulted at the prospect of success. The departure of the French troops removed the only support on which the Roman Catholic church in Scotland rested. It had now entirely lost its hold of public opinion; and the bishops and clergy, seeing all their exertions to be fruitless, quietly submitted to the storm which they could no longer control. As the time for the meeting of parliament approached, all who, by law or ancient custom, were entitled to sit and vote, were summoned by proclamation to attend in their places. Some time was occupied in adjusting a point in dispute, whether or not the parliament was a lawful one, as no commission had been received from the sovereign, and no one was authorised to represent her person. However, after a whole week spent in discussing this question, it was decided that the ninth article of the late treaty was a sufficient warrant for their present meeting; but as they had no commission, the accustomed formalities of crown, sceptre, and sword, commonly called the "riding of parliament," were neglected. Those of the first or spiritual estate who were present in this parliament were, the Archbishop of St. Andrews; the Bishops of Dunkeld, Dunblane, Galloway, Argyle, and the Isles, and Alexander Archbishop of Athens, elect of Galloway and commendator of Inchaffray; the priors of St. Andrews, Coldingham, and St. Mary's Isle;

[1] Sage's Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, pp. 68, 69.
[2] M'Crie's Life of Knox, 197.

the abbots of Cupar, Lindores, Culross, St. Colms-Inch; Newbottle, Holyrood, Kinross, Deer, and New Abbey. In appointing the Lords of the Articles, the prelates who still adhered to the Roman communion were set aside, and Protestant prelates selected for that important function of the Scottish parliament. Accordingly, the Bishops of Galloway and Argyle, the priors of St. Andrews, Coldingham, and St. Mary's Isle, with the sub-prior of St. Andrews, the abbots of Lindores, Culross, St. Colms-Inch, Newbottle, and Holy-Rood, no less than eleven of the prelates, who, *says Knox*, "had *renounced Papistry, and openly professed Jesus Christ* WITH US," were appointed of the spiritual estate to be Lords of the Articles; against which the Roman Catholic prelates protested, and accused these of open apostacy, they having, says Spottiswood, "*openly renounced Popery, and joined themselves to the professors of the truth.*" This point being settled, the first thing presented to the Lords of the Articles was a petition of the barons, gentlemen, burgesses, and other subjects, concerning religion; that,

"I. The *doctrine* of the Roman Church, professed and tyrannously maintained by the clergy, should be condemned, and by act of parliament abolished; namely, the doctrine of transubstantiation—the adoration of Christ's body under the form of bread—the merit of works—papistical indulgences—purgatory—pilgrimages—and praying to saints departed." These were reckoned pestilent errors, such as would bring damnation on the souls of those who entertained them; therefore, they *desired a punishment* for the maintainers of such doctrines.

"II. That a remedy should be found against the profaning of the holy sacrament by men of that profession, and the true discipline of the ancient Church be revived and restored.

"III. That the usurped authority of the Pope of Rome should be discharged, and the patrimony of the Church be employed to the sustentation of the ministry, the provision of schools, and entertainment of the poor, of a long time neglected[1]."

The last clause was by no means satisfactory to those of the lay nobility, who, in that season of anarchy, and during the reign of the "rascal multitude," had seized on the Church property. They were now determined to keep it, and ridiculed Knox's laudable zeal for its recovery, as a "devout imagination." The Protestant ministers might live as they best could; what

[1] Spottiswood.—Knox.—Keith.

right had they to the revenues? It was sufficient for them to feed the flock; the fleece should belong to its lay supporters.'— This most sacrilegious spoliation, the result of the "rascal" mode of reformation, has been of essential injury to the Church of Scotland, and all Knox's most strenuous exertions were ineffectual to preserve the most miserable pittance for the devoted and disinterested ministers of that day.

Making no reply to this last demand, but confining themselves to the first article, the parliament desired the Protestant prelates and clergy to draw up a summary of the doctrine which they required to be established as the national faith. This accordingly within four days was done, and presented to the estates, "who ratified and approved it as wholesome and sound doctrine, grounded on the infallible truth of God." This Confession of Faith was the only standard both for the Episcopal Church and afterwards for the Presbyterian establishment, until it was set aside for the Westminster Confession. This Confession was read in the face of parliament, and ratified by the three estates of the realm, but it never received the queen's assent. Three only of the temporal lords[1] dissented, who sullenly avouched their determination "to believe as their fathers had believed." The Roman Catholic prelates were silent, and made no opposition: whereon the Earl Marischal sarcastically remarked, "It is long since I carried some favour unto the truth, and was somewhat jealous of the Roman religion, but this day hath resolved me of the truth of the one and the falsehood of the other; for seeing my lords, the bishops, —who by their learning can, and for the zeal they have to the truth would, as I suppose, gainsay any thing repugnant unto it,—say nothing against the confession we have heard, I cannot think but it is the very truth of God, and the contrary of it false and deceivable doctrine." But this is not sound logic; for Keith alleges, that *threats* were used to deter the Romish prelates from speaking in defence of their tenets; and the Duke of Chatelherault menaced the archbishop his brother *with death* if he should attempt to speak a word at this time. And it is more than probable that similar threats were intimated to the other bishops and prelates. But a feeble resistance was nevertheless made to the Confession, as we learn by a letter from the primate to Beaton, archbishop of Glasgow, who was then at Paris; and which accounts for the clause in the act which annulled all the leases of the opposing prelates from March 1558. "Please," says the primate, "I maun mak

[1] Probably the Earls of Huntly, Erroll, and Angus.

this litil ticat to your lordschip . . . . For yet the country is not in good rest nor obedience, albeit there be *much speaking* of God and his word, and all men for the most part have made in parliament the confession of their faith, as you shall receive a copy thereof, which was agreed to in parliament the 17th August, and voted *without much resistance*, except from three bishops, *viz.* Dunkeld, Dunblaine, and the third I need not expryme," meaning no doubt himself[1].

At the same time, there were three acts passed in favour of the Protestants; one abolishing the pope's jurisdiction and authority within the realm; a second, for cancelling all statutes made in preceding times for maintenance of idolatry; and the third for the *punishment* of the sayers and hearers of mass[2]. In this act the papal bishops and clergy are declared to be *usurped* ministers; and the Knoxian ministers to be the *only* persons that have power to administer the holy sacraments. The Protestant petitioners, says M'Crie, "declared that they were ready to substantiate the justice of all their demands, and in particular to prove that those who arrogated to themselves the name of clergy were *destitute of all right to be accounted ministers of religion.*" The language and the whole practice of the Knoxian ministers, decidedly shewed that they had entirely thrown overboard the principle of a regular succession in the Christian ministry, and accordingly, in their First Book of Discipline, they assert, "*other ceremonies* than sharp examination, approbation of the ministers and superintendents, with the public consent of the elders and people, *we cannot allow*[3]." However degraded the papal clergy of those days were in learning and morals, they nevertheless possessed the apostolical succession, were regularly and validly ordained, and were then in lawful possession of their benefices as the established clergy of the realm; whereas, although some of these Knoxian ministers were in holy orders, yet most of them were laymen and intruders upon the flocks of the lawful ministers, for it cannot be pretended that they were endowed with any extraordinary divine commission to extirpate the ancient church[4].

The following are some of the clauses of this celebrated

[1] Keith, b. iii. p. 486, 487. Letter dated 18th August, 1560. Robert Chrichton was that year Bishop of Dunkeld, and William Chisholm of Dumblane. In consequence of the latter's opposition to the Reformation, he conveyed the property of the see to his three illegitimate children.—Keith's Cat.

[2] Spottiswood.—Knox. [3] Ch. on Election of Superintendents.

[4] Keith's Hist. b. i. c. xii. 150.

act, which laid the axe to the root of the papal jurisdiction in Scotland.

"Item, The pope is renounced and all his jurisdiction, and statute, that no man in any time hereafter shall seek bull or dispensation, under the pain of barratrie (simony.)

"Item, It is statute and ordained, that there be no mass said within this realm; and the sayer and hearer thereof shall, for the first fault, lose all goods moveable and unmoveable; and themselves to be *punished* at the will of the magistrate, if they are apprehended; for the second fault, banishing of the realm perpetual; for the third fault, DEID (DEATH.)

"Item, It is ordained, that every possessor shall lead his teind, or intromit with it and take it in, even as he did the last year; but shall retain the payment thereof in their own hands, while they get commandment of the council to whom it should be paid.

"Item, It is statute, that because no man compeired of the kirkmen that gave in their bills of complaint, nor any for them, to declare in special wherein they were hurt, after that they were twice called upon, the lords and nobility had done their duty, conform to the articles of Peace, which says, 'if any kirkman were hurt, let him give in his bill to the parliament, and he should be answered as reason would.'

"Item, There is an ordinance made for the lord of St. John that he should have his lordship *heritable*, and *have no more ado with the Pope;* and that the estates should write to the king and queen's majesties to confirm the same."

"How are the times changed," says Mr. Skinner[1], "and what ugly alterations does power and prosperity make upon the people's tempers! It is not above twelve months since these very men humbly petitioned for liberty of conscience, and seemed willing to rest satisfied with being allowed to worship God quietly in their own way. And yet no sooner are their circumstances changed, and themselves set in something like a throne of judgment, but the corruption of human nature appears, the flames of an intemperate zeal break forth, and they boldly express and demand all that security and rigour of which they had so very lately, and with so much justice, complained."

Archbishop Hamilton says that he and the other prelates only consented to meet and vote in this pretended parliament, on the persuasion that its meeting would be sanctioned by the queen and the presence of her representative; and that no in-

[1] Skinner's Eccl. Hist. ii. p. 113-114.

novations of any sort, but particularly in matters of religion, would have been made without her consent. But when they found that the convention proceeded without any such formality, that their adversaries carried every thing by plurality of votes, that threats of murder were intimated to themselves, and that their revenues were confiscated, they were thunderstruck and dispirited. They entirely trusted that the sovereign would disavow the acts of this pretended parliament, and in their confusion and consternation they neglected to leave their protestation on record against such a fundamental revolution. The acts of this convention were sent to France for ratification by the hands of Sir James Sandilands, who was invested with the ecclesiastical title and jurisdiction of "Lord St. John of Jerusalem within Scotland;" and whose title had been declared hereditary by the convention, on his renunciation of the pope. He afterwards resigned the lands of Torphichen, belonging to the Knights of Malta, into the hands of the queen, who erected them into a temporal lordship, and gave him the title of lord Torphichen, in the year 1564[1]. He was instructed to lay them before the queen for ratification, and to assure her majesty of the duty and loyalty of her ancient kingdom. But the Guises had the whole influence at that time in the court of France, and they severely reprimanded him, that he, being a knight of a religious order, "should have taken a commission from rebels, to solicit a ratification of *execrable heresies*." He was accordingly dismissed without ratification of the acts, and in disgrace[2]. But in truth he could not have expected any other reception, when the nature of his embassy is considered as it is developed by Calderwood, who says,—"but he returned with a refusal: *no less was expected;* but yet it was thought meet *to try her (the queen's) disposition: nor was her refusal much regarded;* seeing they had hers and her husband's warrant for holding this parliament. The acts were put in execution after her return, and all again ratified in the parliament holden by the good regent in the minority of King James, an. 1567[3]."

The Confession of Faith, which was the legal standard of the Church of Scotland under its episcopacy, both *titular* and real, and also during the *first set* of presbyterians, was read and ratified by the three estates met in this convention or parliament. And Stevenson, a standard presbyterian author, is of opinion, that "it is doubtful if a purer and less exception-

[1] Keith, b. i. c. 12. 151-2; from a MS. in the Scots College at Paris.
[2] Spottiswood.
[3] Calderwood's True History, p. 11.—Knox, b. iii. p. 213.

able system of divinity hath since been composed[1]. Nevertheless his political friends did compose a much more exceptionable one, during their supremacy in the reign of Charles I.

When Knox's well-known friendship with Calvin is considered, it is matter of surprise that throughout the whole of this "Confession of Faith," the term *predestination* does not once occur. The eighth article, "of Election," is expressed with due moderation, and all that is there said is, "The same eternal God, who of mere grace elected us in Christ Jesus his Son, before the foundation of the world was laid;" but, from the construction of the article, the compilers evidently apply this election to the Christian church, and not, in the Calvanistic sense, to individuals. The terms *elect* and *reprobate* occur in some other places, but in such general language as is warranted by Scripture, and at which no unprejudiced christian need take offence. Its moderation and general orthodoxy is the more surprising when it is considered that Knox was its chief compiler, who was such a slavish follower of all the Genevan reformer's dogmas and opinions. Calvin fixed his notion of predestination in the lapsed state of mankind *after* the Fall, and declared his belief to be, that God having *decreed* to save *some* by means of a Saviour, *left* the rest to the miserable consequences of that fall, without any capability of being benefited by all the offers of grace made to them in common with others. Heresy, however, seldom stops; but always goes on from bad to worse. His disciple Beza carried the effects of God's absolute decrees up to a period *before* the Fall; and taught that the Almighty did, from all eternity, *decree* the fall of Adam and the lapse of his posterity; together with the *salvation* or *damnation* of such per-

[1] Stevenson, i. 106.—Stevenson's Col. of Acts of Parl.—Calderwood's True Hist. of the Church of Scotland, pp. 14—25.—The Confession of Faith and Doctrine of the Protestants of Scotland, authorised by the estates of parliament, "as a doctrine founded on the infallible word of God," contains the following heads:—1. Of God; 2. Of the creation of man; 3. Of original sin; 4. Of the revelation of the promise; 5. The continuance, increase, and preservation of the kirk; 6. Of the incarnation of Christ Jesus; 7. Why it behoved the Mediator to be very God and very Man; 8. Election; 9. Christ's death, passion, and burial; 10. Resurrection; 11. Ascension; 12. Faith in the Holy Ghost; 13. The cause of good works; 14. What works are reputed good before God; 15. The perfection of the law and the imperfection of man; 16. Of the kirk; 17. The immortality of the soul; 18. Of the notes by which the true kirk is discerned from the false, and who shall be judge of the doctrine; 19. The authority of Scripture; 20. Of general councils, of their power, authority, and cause of their convention; 21. Of the sacraments; 22. Of the right administration of the sacraments; 23. To whom the administration of the sacraments appertains; 24. Of the civil magistrate; 25. The gifts freely given to the kirk.

sons as should contribute most to His glory, irrespective of their good or evil conduct in this life. Our first reformers were not, therefore, rigid predestinarians; but were more allied in their sentiments to the Augsburg Confession drawn up by Melancthon, whose mind was supereminently adorned by all the mild and charitable characteristics of the meek and lowly Jesus. In all the various forms which the Scottish reformation assumed, Knox's confession was received as containing the sum and substance of revealed truth. "When episcopacy was regularly established in Scotland in 1610, it became the creed of the church, as was acknowledged by the Scottish bishops in their *declinator* (as it was termed) against the rebellious assembly of Glasgow in the year 1638; and even at the restoration of episcopacy, anno 1661, this very 'Confession' was restored to its former authority, as appears from the language of the Test Act of 1681, which enforces the due observance of it[1]."

But it was necessary to provide the congregation or church with a government as well as with a confession of faith, that, as Knox says, "all things may be carried with order and well." At the rising of the convention, the few Protestant ministers which were in the kingdom were distributed amongst the larger and more populous towns. Knox himself was appointed to preach in Edinburgh; Christopher Goodman, an Englishman of a similarly turbulent spirit as his friend Knox, was sent to St. Andrews; but it seems doubtful whether or not he was in orders: Adam Heriot to Aberdeen; John Row, a priest, to Perth; Paul Methuen, a layman, to Jedburgh; William Christison to Dundee; David Fergusson to Dunfermline; William Harley, a layman, to St. Cuthberts, Edinburgh; and David Lindsay to Leith. The following persons were appointed superintendents or bishops:—Mr. John Spottiswood of Spottiswood, the father of the archbishop, and whose father had been slain at Flodden, was made bishop of Lothian. He travelled into England, and was admitted into holy orders by Archbishop Cranmer, and, on his return in 1547, was appointed rector of Calder, in the county of Linlithgow. John Willocks, formerly a Dominican friar, was made bishop of Glasgow, and he is expressly called *bishop* by Thomas Archibald, Chamberlain to Archbishop Beaton, then in Paris, in the postscript of one of his letters:—"P.S. John Willocks is made *bishop of Glasgow*, now in your lordship's absence, and placed in your place of Glas-

[1] Skinner's Theological Works, i. 389—391.

gow[1];" and the same functionary tells us in the letter itself, that Willocks had taken possession of the Dean of Glasgow's house, and secured £1000 per annum out of the revenues of the archbishopric. John Winram, formerly subprior of St. Andrews, and who, we may suppose, was in holy orders, was made bishop of Fife. John Erskine, Esq., of Dun, and a layman, was appointed bishop of the counties of Forfar and Kincardine, which compose the diocese of Brechin. John Carsewell was appointed bishop of Argyle and the Isles; and "with this small number," says Spottiswood, "was the plantation of the church undertaken." Alexander Gordon, bishop of Galloway, was the only bishop in office at this time who had turned Protestant; "and yet," says Bishop Keith, "he was so far from being allowed to exercise *any episcopal jurisdiction*, that when he craved to be a visitor only of the churches in the district of Galloway, it was refused him, and another was preferred: nor was he ever nominated to be a superintendent by the new modelled assemblies; nay, he was once *suspended* by them from the office of an ordinary preacher." This is strange and inconsistent; but Keith is here mistaken: for although Knox had set aside ordination as unnecessary, and those prelates who had joined him, and really could give that grace, were studiously insulted and degraded, and those who were only in priests' orders, or in no orders whatever, were set in authority over them; yet Gordon was afterwards made a superintendent. "But when the popish bishops saw things carried on by open *rebellion* and *mobbing*, when they saw such *universal rapine* and levelling, and when nothing would please but a *renunciation of their own sacred orders*, and a truckling under some of the meanest mechanics, to be either received or not received as ministers of the church of Christ, according as they should think proper, what wonder is it that *such a reformation* looked formidable and detestable unto them, and, in very deed, no better than an utter overturning of all that was sacred[2]?"

This is a practical carrying out of the new principle introduced by Knox into his new discipline, that ordination was unnecessary. In the chapter on "Admission," which means ordination, the new polity says: "Other ceremonies than the *public approbation of the people*, and *declaration* of the chief minister (the superintendent) that the person there presented is appointed to serve the church, *we cannot approve*: for, albeit the apostles used imposition of hands, yet, seeing

[1] Keith, b. iii. p. 490. [2] Keith, b. i. c. 10. p. 23.

the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremony we judge *not necessary!*" Mr. Knox has here shewn himself wiser in this matter than the apostles themselves, and the whole church of Christ previous to his time. "But," says Bishop Keith, quaintly, "some men are fond of their own inventions; and, provided they be new, no matter how extravagant otherwise." The papal right of *investiture* which had been so much complained of, was now, however, turned into *erastianism*, a vice which was inherent in the popular nature of the Knoxian, but much more so in its successor, the Melvillian Kirk. In the election of the superintendent of Lothian, Knox tells us "how that the minister declared to the people that the *lords of Secret Council* had given *charge and power* to the churches of Lothian *to choose* Mr. John Spottiswood superintendent;" and he further tells us that the appointments of the ministers for the different towns were made by the commissioners of burghs, with some of the nobility. Another striking likeness to popery in the Knoxian church was the placing the whole kingdom in a situation exactly similar to the old popish tyranny of an *Interdict*. The whole of the papal parochial clergy retained their benefices, but were sternly interdicted from performing any sacerdotal duties, either in public or in private, to those even of their parishioners who still adhered to the faith of their fathers. The "Congregation" had only provided *fourteen* ministers, including five superintendents, to supply the place of several thousands of secular and regular clergy, for the service of the whole realm! Here was in *reality* the wasting of the boar, and the devouring of the wild beast. Knox and the rabble had broken down the hedges of the ancient vineyard, which covered the hills with its shadow, and whose boughs had been sent into every corner of the kingdom; but their whole efforts had been directed to pull down: little or nothing had been done towards building up a new fabric in the place of the old. Men's minds were alienated from what little life remained in the papal church; and her hierarchy were sternly prohibited from exercising their functions; and, as there were so few to take their occupation, the people were scattered on the hills as sheep without a shepherd, and left to the natural evil disposition of their own hearts, the effects of which were soon shewn in a general spirit of irreligion and of irreverence for sacred things, and which remain striking characteristics of the presbyterian establishment to the present day.

There were only fourteen protestant ministers distributed among the principal towns to supply the place lately occupied by such a huge army of ecclesiastics. The number of the

clergy in the whole kingdom may be estimated by those of St. Andrews the metropolitan city, where there were at least one hundred and sixty constantly resident, besides those who might be occasionally there. These were silenced, and were not allowed to officiate in any way, or under any pretext, to a population of twelve or thirteen thousand inhabitants, whose religious wants were supplied by only *one layman*, Mr. Goodman! and in a register of ministers, exhorters, and readers, published by the Maitland Club, it is stated that so scarce was the first class of instructors, the ministers, that *one individual* was appointed to minister the sacraments *to the whole county of Peebles!* "It was many years," observes Mr. Lyon, "before the country could adapt itself to the new order of things, and in the interval *great disorder* ensued[1]." The same author observes, that "'the Book of the Universal Kirk of Scotland,' as it is singularly called, furnishes sad proofs of the disorder, immorality, and intolerance, which prevailed throughout Scotland at the period we are now reviewing. We read of numberless cases of fornication, adultery, and incest; some of them of a very disgusting character. Indeed, *impurity* seems to have been the besetting sin of Scotland at this time. In Perth alone, whose population did not exceed six thousand, there were, on an average, *eighty* convicted cases of adultery annually, even under the vigilant superintendence of their first protestant minister, Mr. Row: and Mr. Petrie informs us that, in 1570, a report was made to the General Assembly, from a very small district, of *six hundred* persons convicted of having so offended, and who had not yet satisfied the discipline of the kirk. In the same records we read of complaints entered against all the five superintendents, and many of the ministers, for various delinquencies, but especially pluralities, non-residence, and negligence in visiting their charges; and, at one of the sittings of the assembly, twenty-seven ministers were complained of by name, 'that they had wasted the patrimony of their benefices, and made no residence at their kirks.' We find also frequent petitions for more superintendents or commissioners of kirks, for more money to pay them, more kirks to preach in, and manses to live in; and several from the parishes to which the superintendents were attached, that their spiritual concerns were neglected; and, to take a case connected with St. Andrews, the parishioners of Tynningham complained that while they paid their tithes to St. Mary's College, *neither word nor sacraments were dispensed among them.* We read of some ministers throwing up their

[1] Life and Times of Archbishop Hamilton, in Episc. Mag. vol. ii. p. 337.

office, and resorting to civil employments for want of a livelihood, and others expressing their wish to do the same, but forbidden by the assembly; and what is curious, there is the following question recorded as gravely proposed and answered:—'*Q.* Whether a minister or reader may tap ale, beer, or wine, and keep an open tavern?—*A.* A minister or reader who taps ale, beer, or wine, and keeps an open tavern, should be exhorted by the commissioners to keep decorum.' In short, we discover instances of the prevalence of *all kinds of vice*, and of those who committed them promising to amend, but seldom performing: instances of readers usurping the office of ministers by dispensing the sacraments; of papists commanded to join themselves to the new establishment on pain of excommunication; of orders to suppress all heretical books, and not to allow them to be imported or printed; of compulsatory abolition of the fasts and festivals of the church; of the refusal of lay-commendators to pay their thirds of benefices; of simony;" &c. &c.[1]

[1] Life and Times of Archbishop Hamilton, in Episc. Mag. ii. 339, 340.

CHAPTER V.

GOVERNMENT—WORSHIP—FAITH—OPINIONS OF THE SCOTTISH AND FOREIGN REFORMERS.

Penalties for saying or hearing mass.—Disappointment of Knox's hopes.—First Book of Discipline.—Readers.—Ministers.—Superintendents.—Dioceses of the superintendents, and their powers.—Change of names and titles.—Principal Bailie's opinion.—Extracts from the Book of Discipline.—Thirty marks of superiority in the superintendents.—Opinions of Erskine of Dun, and Dr. Cook.—The presbyterian controversy not then agitated.—Calvin and his opinions.—His rejection of ordination.—His approbation of episcopacy.—Archbishops.—No universal head of the church.—Beza.—His opinion of the church of England.—Synod of Dort.—Salmasius.—Blondell.—John Knox.—Admission of Spottiswood.—John Douglass's admission.—Assembly's letter to the English bishops.—Episcopacy not objected to by the first preachers in Scotland.—Wishart.—A Liturgy.—Borthwick.—Influence of England in the Scottish reformation.—Communion of the two national churches.—Evidences of it.—Buchanan.—The Book of Common Prayer.—Knox's prayers.—Established liturgical service.—Citations from the old liturgy.—The creed repeated, and the scriptures read.—Catechism taught.—Singing of hymns.—Godfathers.—The Lord's supper.—Extemporary prayers.—Apostolical succession disregarded.—Knox's account of the beginning of his church.—Archbishop Hamilton's letter.—Remarks.—Beza's tract.—Marks of the church.—Titles and dignities of the Christian priesthood.

1561.—"THIS history of the reformation which I go now to write," says Archbishop Spottiswood, "will let us see great changes made in the church. What do I say—changes? We shall see the state of the church quite overturned, and, with the reformation that was much desired (and was, indeed, most needful), many things done extremely hurtful both to the church and kingdom; as temples demolished, religious places ruined, the rents and rights of the church sacrilegiously usurped, and the external policy, than which a more wise form of government could not be devised, utterly overthrown. Thus (as it falleth out sometimes in bodies replenished with corrupt humours) the remedy intended for purging out one disease brought with it many infections, such as this age, perhaps the succeeding, shall not see fully cured and put away . . . . . No doubt the wiser sort wished the work to have proceeded with advice, and by the direction of lawful authority; but it was the fault of them in place that would give no ear to the petitions for reformation often preferred, and drove the people

unto the desperate resolution they took, which was to do the work by themselves that was denied by others whose care chiefly it ought to have been."

On the 23d of August, 1560, the celebration of mass was abolished, the papal clergy were declared to be usurpers, and the Protestant preachers to be the only true ministers. The penalties of this act shewed that the age of persecution had not passed away with the papal hierarchy; for it was enacted that all who celebrated or were present at the celebration of mass, should be punished, for the first offence with confiscation of goods; for the second, banishment; and for the third they were to *suffer death!* The act does not specify whether death should be inflicted by burning alive, or by any other of the approved methods of the papal church; but the *principle* of persecution and bigotry is the same in both. The outcry which the Knoxites raised against the cruel proceedings of the papal church, was as much owing to their being themselves the sufferers, as from any real abhorrence of their unchristian nature. After the abolition of the papal jurisdiction, all the prelates and other churchmen were prohibited from exercising any authority in virtue of that jurisdiction under the "pain of barratry; that is to say, proscription, banishment, and never to bruik, that is, never to be capable of holding honour, office, or dignity within this realm."

Knox never dreamed that the revenues of the church were to be secularized; but that he and his colleagues were simply to remove the old incumbents, and then take possession of their benefices. But those *saints* and *earnest professours*, the nobility, were quite of another mind. Knox proposed "that annual deacons should be surrogated into the place of the former legal proprietors, and that these deacons should distribute the incomes according to warrants signed by the ministers, elders, &c." He foolishly imagined that all his party were as disinterested as himself; but his eyes were soon opened to the selfish, grasping covetousness of the men in power, who treated his "*devout imagination*," as they termed his scheme, with the utmost scorn and contempt. Archbishop Hamilton sent a Mr. Brand, a clergyman, to him with some seasonable and good advice. "But," says Bishop Keith, "Knox was too wise in his own eyes to accept the primate's advice. He imagined he had no more ado to settle the revenues of the church, in what form he pleased to chalk out, than to go hither and thither with a mob of people at his heels, and order them to pull down the fabrics of the churches; for in *this* he got ready obedience. He imagined that new acts of parliament, and new charters, trans-

ferring the rights of the church-lands to his annual deacons, were to be as easily obtained as he could declaim against the corrupt practices of the church officers; but he was even forced to see his error when those good men, whom he calls *saints* and *professors*, could hardly be prevailed with to allow himself bread to his belly, after they had entered into the possessions of the church: but it was then too late for him to look back, and he must content himself *secretly* to see that the archbishop was wiser than he. The nobles were willing to let Mr. Knox redress the *spirituality*; but *they* would take care to reform the *temporality* of the church by themselves; and the truth is, they reformed *clean and low. They left no superfluities; no, not even bare necessaries*[1]."

Knox says that some of the nobility approved of the Book of Discipline, and were desirous of giving it the authority of law; but the chief spoliators of the church objected to it so much, that it became odious to them, "and was termed, in their mockage, *devout imaginations*." "Some were licentious, some had greedily gripped the possessions of the church, and others thought that they would not lack their part in Christ's coat; yea, and that before ever He was crucified, as by the preachers they were often rebuked. . . . . Assuredly some of us have wondered how men that profess godliness could, of so long continuance, hear the threatenings of God against thieves, and against their houses, and knowing themselves guilty in such things as were openly rebuked, and that they never had remorse of conscience, neither yet intended to restore any thing of that which long they had stolen." Knox began to find that the poisoned chalice which he had prepared for others was now commended to his own lips; and the measure that he had meted to others was now to be measured out to himself. "*There were none*," said he, "*within the realm more unmerciful to the poor ministers, than were they which possessed the greatest rents of the church*[2]."

In a convention of the reforming ministers, January 1561, Knox, with the assistance of Winram, Spottiswood father of the archbishop, Willock, Douglass rector of St. Andrews, and John Row, drew up the "First Book of Discipline," wherein THREE distinct orders of ministers are decidedly established,—the superintendent, the minister, and the reader. The duties of the reader are described to be—"To the church which cannot presently be furnished with ministers, men must be appointed that can distinctly READ THE COMMON PRAYERS

[1] Keith, b. iii. c. i. p. 494-6. [2] Knox's History, b. iii. p. 244.

AND SCRIPTURES, for the exercise both of themselves and the church, until they grow to a greater perfection; *because he who is now a reader may in process of time attain to a* FARTHER DEGREE, *and be admitted to the holy ministry.*" The duties of the parish minister were, to preach, read the *common prayers*, catechise youth, and administer the sacraments. Those of the superintendent were, without any doubt, that of episcopal government and jurisdiction; "because it is found expedient for the erecting and planting of churches, and appointing of ministers, that at this time there be selected ten or twelve superintendents, we have thought good to *design their bounds, set down their office*, the manner of their election, and the causes which may deserve deposition from their charge[1]." Then follows the designation of their dioceses and places of residence;—than which there cannot be a clearer demonstration that they held episcopal authority over large districts of country, and which would be quite incompatible with the local duties of a parish minister:—

"The country of Orkney shall have a superintendent, and his *diocese* shall be the Isles of Orkney, with the countries of Caithness and Strathnaver. His residence to be in the town of Kirkwall.

"The superintendent of Ross, his *diocese* shall comprehend Ross, Sutherland, Moray, with the Isles of Skye and Lergis, and their adjacents. His residence should be in the Canonry of Ross.

"The superintendent of Argyle shall have for his *diocese* Argyle, Cantyre, Lorne, the south isles of Arran and Bute, with the isles adjacent, and the country of Lochaber. His residence to be in Argyle.

"The superintendent of Aberdeen, his *diocese* shall comprehend all betwixt Dee and Spey, that is, the sheriffdoms of Aberdeen and Banff. His residence to be in Old Aberdeen.

"The superintendent of Brechin shall have for his *diocese* the sheriffdoms of Mearns, Angus, and the Brae of Mar, unto Dundee; and he shall keep his residence at Brechin.

"The superintendent of Fife shall have for his *diocese* the sheriffdoms of Fife, Fotheringham, and Perth, unto Stirling. His residence shall be in St. Andrews.

"The superintendent of Lothian, his *diocese* shall comprehend the sheriffdoms of Lothian, Stirling, Merse, Lauderdale, and the Stow of Tweeddale. His residence to be in Edinburgh.

"The superintendent of Jedburgh shall have for his *diocese*

[1] First Book of Discipline, sect. v.

Teviotdale, Tweeddale, and the Forrest of Ettrick. His residence to be in Jedburgh.

"The superintendent of Glasgow, his *diocese* shall comprehend Clydesdale, Renfrew, Monteith, Kyle, and Cunningham. His residence to be in Glasgow.

"The superintendent of Dumfries shall have for his *diocese* Galloway, Carrick, Nithsdale, and Annandale, with the rest of the dales in the west. His residence to be at Dumfries.

"These men must not be suffered to live *idle*, as the bishops have done heretofore; neither must they remain where gladly they would, but they must be preachers themselves, and not remain in one place above three or four months; after which, *they must enter in visitation of their whole bounds*, preach thrice a week at least, and not rest till the churches be wholly planted, and *provided of ministers,—at least, of readers.*

"In their *visitations, they must try the life, diligence, and behaviour of the ministers, the order of their churches*, and the manners of their people, how the poor are provided, and how the youth are instructed. They must admonish when admonition needeth, and redress all things that by good council they are able to compose. Finally, they must take note of all heinous crimes, that the same may be corrected by the censures of the church[1]."

In the above quotation, the proof of the superiority of the superintendents or bishops of the new establishment is incontestible; for they were not to live *idle*, as the popish bishops had done. The proper marks of episcopal power and jurisdiction are conferred on the superintendent, who is instructed to provide the *two inferior orders of ministers and readers* for the vacant churches, and to inspect and inquire into their manners and doctrine. A stronger proof that our reformers were episcopalian, and held episcopacy as a fundamental of religion, can scarcely be required.

The First Book of Discipline specifies three distinct orders of ministers; the lowest of whom, the *reader*, corresponds to the order of deacons, and like them, they were to purchase to themselves a good degree, or to be advanced to the second order of *ministers*, in process of time. It may be remarked, that the national abhorrence of popery had become so great, that it was found expedient to change all the ecclesiastical names and terms. The deacons, therefore, were called in the new polity *Readers*, priests were denominated *Ministers*, and bishops were called *Superintendents*; ordina-

[1] First Book of Discipline, head v.

tion was denominated *Admission*, and the church was termed the *Congregation*. Thus the *names only* were changed for others that had not been commonly used in the papal church; but the *things* which they denominated remained substantially the same. But we have a further, and what almost amounts to a synodical acknowledgment of the episcopacy of the Knoxian superintendents, by the assembly of 1638, which has recently come to light by the publication of Principal Baillie's Letters; in one of which he says, "that according to the express words of the assembly, 1580-81, episcopacy was to be distinguished: episcopacy as used and taken in the church of Scotland I thought to be removed; yea, that it was a popish error, against Scripture and antiquity, and so then abjured; but episcopacy *simpliciter*, such as was *in the ancient church*, AND *in our church* DURING *Knox's* DAYS, *in the person of the* SUPERINTENDENTS, it was for many reasons to be removed, but *not abjured* in our confession of faith. This, Argyle and Loudon, and many, took out of my mouth, *as not ill said, and nothing against their mind*, who spake not of episcopacy *simpliciter*, but in our own church, whether or not it had been condemned at the time of the covenants' first subscription[1]."

Respecting the superintendents, Knox says: "Such is the present necessity, that the examination and admission of the *superintendents cannot be so strict as* AFTERWARDS *it must*: for the *present*, therefore, we think it sufficient that the *council* nominate so many as may serve the provinces above written, or then give commission to men of best knowledge, who have the fear of God, to do the same. If so many cannot be found at present as necessity requireth, it is better that those provinces wait till God shall provide, than that men, unable to edify and *govern* the church, be suddenly placed in the charge. If any superintendent depart this life, or happen to be deposed, the *minister* of the chief town within that province, with the magistrates and council, the elders and deacons of the said town, shall nominate the superintendents of two or three provinces next adjacent, within the space of twenty days,—two or three of the most godly and learned ministers within the realm, that from among them, with public consent, one may be elected to the office then vacant. The twenty days expired, and no man presented, three of the next adjacent provinces, with consent of their *superintendents*, *ministers*, *and elders*, shall enter into the privilege of the chief town, and shall pre-

[1] Baillie's Letters and Journals, from 1637—1642. Edinb. edit. 1841, p. 158.

sent one or two, if they list, to be examined according to the order; and it shall be lawful for all the churches within the diocese, within the same time, to nominate such persons as they esteem worthy of election. The day appointed for the election being come, the ministers of the province, with the superintendents next adjacent, shall examine the learning, manners, prudence, and ability to govern the church. Other ceremonies than this examination, the approbation of ministers and superintendents, with the public consent of elders and people, we do not admit. No superintendent may be translated at the pleasure or request of any one province, without the council of the whole church. *After* the church shall be established, and *three years are past*, no man shall be called to the office of a superintendent, who hath not, two years at least, given a proof of his faithful labours in the ministry of some church[1].'

The First Book of Discipline itself is a sufficient testimony that its compilers were of episcopal principles, even were other evidence wanting; but their own practice was the very best commentary. Knox names the parties, six in number, who assumed and exercised the episcopal office to the day of their death—John Winram, who lived and died superintendent or bishop of Strathern; John Spottiswood received his instructions in the reformed doctrines from Cranmer the English martyr, and was twenty years superintendent of Lothian. "He lamented extremely," says his son, "the case of the church in his last days, when he saw the ministers take such liberty as they did, and heard of the disorders raised in the church *through that confused* PARITY *which men laboured to introduce*: for the *doctrine*, said he, which we profess is good, but the *old polity* was undoubtedly the better." John Willock, an English divine, lived and died superintendent of the west. John Douglass was made archbishop of St. Andrews in Knox's life-time, and died in that see; John Row was one of those who defended Episcopacy against the innovations of Andrew Melville at the conference in 1575. John Knox, who was the principal man in digesting the discipline of the infant establishment, was himself a parish minister in England, and was offered a bishopric in that kingdom by Edward VI., his opinion on this subject ought to be held conclusive. He says, "superintendents and overseers were nominated, that all things in the church might be carried with order and weil,"—"a reason," says Sage, "which, as it has held since the apostles' times, will

[1] First Book of Discipline, head 7.

continue to hold so long as the church continues[1]." At the admission of John Spottiswood to the superintendency of Lothian, John Knox asserted in his sermon the necessity, and not the bare expediency, of superintendents or overseers, as well as ministers: and the learned author of "The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery" has enumerated no less than *thirty* marks of superiority in the superintendent over the parish minister, of which the following is an abridgment:—

1. The superintendents had districts, or dioceses, of considerable extent, comprehending many parishes; whereas the ordinary minister was confined to a single parish.

2. As superintendents had larger districts than parish ministers, so there was a difference in their election. Parish ministers were to enter to churches by presentation from the patron, and collation from the superintendent. But the election of superintendents was quite different; they were to be nominated by the council, and elected by the nobility and gentry within their dioceses.

3. The superintendent of the diocese, with consent of the elders, could depose the parish ministers, but it required a convention of all the parish ministers to depose the superintendent.

4. The superintendent inducted the parish ministers, but superintendents were to be admitted by the superintendents next adjacent, with all the ministers of the province, or diocese.

5. In the case of translation, the General Assembly, holden at Edinburgh, December 1562, "gives power to every superintendent within his bounds (or diocese) to translate ministers from one kirk to another, charging the ministers so translated to obey the voice and commandment of the superintendent." But according to the First Book of Discipline, "no superintendent might be translated at the pleasure or request of any one province, without the council of the whole church, and that for grave causes and considerations."

6. The First Book of Discipline ordains, that "after the church shall be established, and three years are past, no man shall be called to the office of a superintendent who hath not, two years at least, given a proof of his faithful labours in the ministry,"—a caution simply inapplicable to a parish minister.

7. The First Book of Discipline appropriates an annual living to the superintendent five times the amount of that of any

[1] Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, p. 75, 76.

parish minister; and this at a time when the Roman Catholic bishops were in possession of their dioceses, and enjoyed the revenues. But in 1567, when it was resolved to deprive all the Roman Catholic bishops, it was agreed in the General Assembly, by the churchmen on the one part, and the lords and barons on the other, that superintendents should succeed in their places.

8. Superintendents, by virtue of their office, were *constant* but *not elective* members of the General Assemblies; and, in the General Assembly held at Perth, 25th June, 1563, it is statuted, "That every superintendent shall be present the first day of the Assembly, under the pain of forty shillings."

9. It belonged to the office of superintendent to try and examine those who were candidates for the ministry. The First Book of Discipline, head iv., ordains, "That such as take upon them the office of preachers, who shall not be found qualified therefor *by* the superintendent, shall *by him* be placed as readers." And, head v., "No person within the age of twenty-one years may be admitted to the office of a reader, but such must be chosen *by the superintendent*." And the Edinburgh Assembly, 15th December, 1562, ordains, "That inhibition be made against all such ministers as have not been presented by the people, or part thereof, to the superintendent, and have not been appointed to their charges by the superintendents, after trial and examination."

10. Superintendents had the power of granting *collation* on presentation by the patron, as appears by act of Assembly, December, 1562, and 7th act Parl. 1st Jac. VI. Also the Assembly holden at Perth, June, 1563, appoints, "That when any benefices chance to vaik, or are now vacant, that a qualified person be presented to the *superintendent of that province* (or bishopric) where the benefice lieth, and, if found sufficient, he be admitted."

11. Superintendents had the power of planting ministers in parish churches, where the patrons were negligent. For it is ordered in the First Book of Discipline, head iv., "That if the people be found negligent in electing a minister the space of forty days, the *superintendent*, with his council, may present unto them a man whom *he may judge* apt to feed the flock."

12. And as he had thus the power of trying and collating *ministers*, and planting churches in the case of a *jus devolutum*, so he had also the sole power of *ordination*, which was called at that time *admission*; for as they substituted the word *superintendent* for *bishop*, so they changed the word *ordination* into *admission*.

13. All *Presbyters*, or parish *ministers*, once admitted into churches, were bound to pay *canonical obedience* to their *superintendents*. In the Assembly at Edinburgh, 30th June, 1562, "it was concluded by the whole *ministers* assembled, *that all ministers should be subject to the superintendents* in all lawful admonitions." And in that Act of Assembly, December 1562, it is ordained, "that *ministers* translated from one (parish) church to another, are commanded *to obey the voice and commandment of the superintendent*." Indeed, it was part of an article presented by the church to the council, 27th May, 1561, "that an act should be made, appointing a (civil) punishment for such as *disobeyed* or *contemned* the *superintendents* in their functions."

14. The superintendent had power to visit all the churches within his diocese; and in that visitation (First Book of Discipline, head v.) "to try the life, diligence, and behaviour of the ministers; the order of their churches; the manners of their people; how the poor are provided; and how the youth are instructed." And in these visitations he had power "to take account of what books every (parish) minister had, and how he profited from time to time by them."—Act of Assembly, 29th June, 1562.

15. The superintendent had power vested in him by the First Book of Discipline, head viii., *to depose parish ministers*. And, act of Assembly, 6th March, 1573, it is enacted, "that if any *minister* reside not at the church where his charge is, he shall be summoned before his *superintendent*, to whom the Assembly gives power to depose him."

16. The *superintendent* had power to translate *ministers* from one parish to another. Act of Assembly, 25th June, 1564, "It is concluded, that a (parish) minister being once placed, may not leave that congregation without the knowledge of the flock, and *consent of the superintendent*." These are powers, methinks, scarcely reconcileable with *parity*.

17. The superintendent had power to *nominate ministers in his diocese* to be members of the General Assembly. Act of Assembly, June 1562, ordains, "That no minister leave his flock (parish) for coming to the Assembly, except he have complaints to make, or be complained of, or at least warned thereto, *by the superintendent*." And in the Act of Assembly, 1st July, 1563, it is ordained, "That none have place to vote except *superintendents*, commissioners[1] appointed for visiting

[1] Superintendent and commissioner were terms synonymous with bishop:—"Some brethren motioned, that it might be demanded of the commissioners of

the kirks, and ministers brought with them." From which it is plain, that the *superintendent nominated the ministers* they brought with them to the Assembly, and that the rest of the ministers had only the privilege of consenting. Lord Glammis, in his letter to Beza, 1574, informs that notable Presbyterian, "That it had been the custom, ever since the reformation, that the superintendents, or bishops, still *nominated* the *ministers* who met in General Assemblies." This was not a private opinion of my lord Glammis, who was lord Chancellor of the kingdom, but was the result of a consultation. This was a *branch of episcopal power* that gave such great offence to Calderwood and Petrie, the historians most devoted to the Presbyterian interest, that they have endeavoured to mystify and obscure it as much as possible, and entirely suppress the powers vested in the superintendent of visiting the parish churches.

18. The superintendent had the power of *appointing diocesan synods.* He had the sole appointment of the meeting, and they were always called *the superintendent's synods.* Act of Assembly, December, 1562, ordains, "That the superintendents appoint synodal conventions twice in the year, in April and October, on such days of the said months as the superintendents shall think good."

19. Superintendents had power, within their own dioceses, to *appoint* diocesan fasts.

20. Another considerable instance of the powers vested in superintendents was, that of *assigning to parish ministers their stipends or livings.* This is placed beyond a doubt by act of Assembly, July, 1569: "And, therefore, the kirk in one voice, by this their act, gave their full power and commission *to every superintendent*, within their own bounds (or diocese), with the advice and consent of their synodal conventions, to give every minister, exhorter, and reader, particular assignations, *ad vitam*, as they should find the same expedient, under the *superintendent's* subscription. And, as concerning the superintendents and commissioners of kirks, their provision and assignation shall be made by the General Assembly."

21. Appeals were to be made to the superintendents by the inferior judicatories. Act of Assembly, June, 1563, ordains, "Concerning the order of appellation, it is statuted and or-

Galloway and Orkney if they thought that they might, with a safe conscience, discharge both the office of a superintendent and a lord in the session. . . . *Here we see superintendent and commissioner are taken for* ONE *and the same thing: and the bishops of Galloway and Orkney are now called* COMMISSIONERS *of Galloway and Orkney.*"—Calderwood, p. 39, anno 1563.

dained, that, if any person find himself aggrieved by any sentence given by *any minister*, elders, or deacons, (or any kirk-session), it shall be lawful for the person so aggrieved *to appeal to the superintendent of that diocese*, and his synodal convention, within ten days next after. And the said superintendent shall take cognition whether it was well appealed or not, and give his sentence thereupon." By the same act, the appellant, if he thought himself injured by the *sentence of the superintendent*, might, as was reasonable, appeal to the General Assembly.

22. But if the superintendent should find the appeal from his sentence to be *male appellatum*, he had the power of *fining* the appellant. Act of Assembly, June, 1563, it is enacted, "If the appellant justifies not his appellation before the superintendent and his convention aforesaid, then the superintendent shall impute a *pain* on the said appellant, as he shall think good, besides the expenses of the party."

23. And as the superintendent had this power of receiving appeals from the inferior courts, so he had also the *power*, with the advice of his synod, or such of the ministers of his diocese as *he should choose* for that purpose, *to determine intricate cases of conscience or government*. Act of Assembly, December, 1564, "It is ordained, that no questions be proposed by any brother, till the affairs of the kirk, and the order thereof, be first treated and ended; and, therefore, if any brother have a question worthy to be proposed, that the same be presented in writing: and, if the same require hasty resolution, it shall be decided in the present assembly, before the end thereof, otherwise the *decision* of the same shall be *referred* to every one of the *superintendents*, within whose diocese the question is proposed, and they, and every one of them, with a certain number of ministers as they shall think meet to appoint for assisting, shall hear the reasonings of the aforesaid questions, and thereafter present the reasonings in writing, affirmative or negative, which every one of them shall report to next Assembly." Act of Assembly, July, 1568, "It is statuted and ordained, that ministers, exhorters, and readers, or other persons, hereafter trouble not nor molest the General Assembly with such things as *superintendents may and ought to decide* in their synodal conventions." This makes his powers evident in cases of appeal, which were *first* to be brought before him, and *by him only* to be remitted to the General Assembly if he thought it necessary. But the more decisive act on this point is that of Assembly, 5th March, 1571, where it is enacted, "That *all questions be first* proposed to *superintendents* or

commissioners in their synodal conventions, and there receive solution; and, if *they* think them too hard, that they bring them to the General Assembly; but that no *private minister* bring questions to the Assembly *prima instantia*."

24. It belonged exclusively to the superintendents to *judge* of divorces,—a point of great intricacy and importance. Act of Assembly, December 1562, ordains, "That no ministers or others, bearing office in the kirk, take in hand to cognosce or decide in actions of divorcement, *except the superintendents*, and they to whom they shall give special commission."

25. Superintendents also enjoined penances on greater criminals. Act of Assembly, 25th June, 1564, "Touching such as relapse the third time into any kind of crime, such as drunkenness or fornication, it is statuted and ordained, that no particular *minister* admit such persons to repentance, but *that they send them to the superintendent* of the diocese where the crimes were committed, with information." The Countess of Argyle was accused of a horrid scandal in being present at the baptism of the prince, afterwards James VI., which was performed in the Roman Catholic manner, and she was therefore cited to give satisfaction to the church. She was ordered to do it by the General Assembly, in such manner, and at such time, as the *superintendent* of Lothian (within whose diocese the scandal was committed) *should appoint*.

26. The superintendent had power to restore penitents to their offices in the church, after absolution. Thus, Thomas Duncanson, *reader* at Stirling, had fallen into the sin of fornication, for which he was silenced. He had performed his penance and was absolved. Then the question was put to the Assembly, Dec. 1563—Whether or not having made public penance, he might be restored to his office? The Assembly determined, that *he might not, till the church at Stirling should make request to the* SUPERINTENDENT *for him*.

27. The superintendent had exclusively the power of excommunication, in cases of contumacy. Act of Assembly, 1st July, 1562, "That in cases of contumacy, the *minister* shall give notice to the *superintendent*, with whose advice excommunication is to be pronounced."

28. It belongeth also to the office of a superintendent to delate atrocious criminals to the civil magistrate, that condign punishment might be inflicted on them. In a convention of the Kirk, 16th December, 1567, (to wait on the motions of the parliament) it is enacted, "that ministers, elders, and deacons make search within their bounds, if the crimes of incest and adultery were committed, and to signify the same to the

superintendent, that he may notify it to the civil magistrate." Such was the power of superintendents in the church, and her discipline.

29. Because universities, colleges, and schools, are the seminaries of learning, and, by consequence, nurseries of the ministers, the power of superintendents over them was very considerable. First Book of Discipline, head v.—"If the principal or head of any college within the University of St. Andrews, died, the members of the college, being sworn to follow their consciences, were to nominate three of the most sufficient men within the university. This done, the superintendent of Fife, by himself or his special procurator, with the rector and the rest of the principals, were to choose one of these three, and constitute him principal. And when the rector was chosen, he was to be confirmed by the *superintendent*. By the same book, the money collected in any college for upholding the fabric, was to be counted and employed at the sight of the superintendent. And the act of Assembly, 25th January, 1565, petitioned the queen "that none might be permitted to have charge of schools, colleges, or universities, but such as should be tried by the superintendent." This power was ratified by the 11th act of 1st parl. Jac. VI. 1567. And accordingly, the laird of Dun, superintendent of Angus, holding a visitation of the University of Aberdeen, in July 1568, by a formal sentence, turned out all the Roman Catholic members. Petrie, a violent Presbyterian historian, bears strong evidence of the paramount authority of superintendents. In page 362, he states, that, "I, John Erskine, superintendent of Angus and Mearns, having commission of the church to visit the sheriffdoms of Aberdeen and Banff, by the advice, counsel, and consent of the ministers, elders, and commissioners of the Kirk present, decern, conclude, and for final sentence pronounce, that Master Alexander Anderson," &c.

30. The revising and licensing of books were committed to the care of the superintendents. Act of Assembly 1563, it is ordained, "That no work be set forth in print, neither published in writing, touching religion or doctrine, until such time as it shall be presented to the superintendent of the diocese, and advised and improven by him, or by such as he shall call, of the most learned within his bounds[1]."

Lest the above thirty marks of episcopal pre-eminence in the superintendents should be deemed insufficient to establish the

[1] Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, pp. 120—139.

point of our reformers having been episcopalians both in principle and practice, I beg to refer to part of a letter from Erskine of Dun, superintendent of Angus, Knox's intimate friend and fellow-labourer, to the regent, dated Nov. 1571, in which he asserts, not only the expediency, but the divine authority of the episcopal office in the church of Christ. Considering their intimacy and close friendship, we cannot imagine that the superintendent of Angus would, in a solemn official document, addressed to the regent of the kingdom, support doctrines at variance with those of his friend Knox, and of the fundamental principles of the then establishment; and of which the regent himself could not be ignorant[1]. The letter in question respects the invidious subject of tithes, which Erskine asserts must belong to the Kirk, "wha onlie hes the distributione and ministratione of spirituall thingis..... And as to the question, if it be expedient a superintendent to be where a qualified bishop is?—*I understand a bishop or superintendent to be but* ONE OFFICE, *and where the one is the other is.*"

But lest Mr. Erskine of Dun should be supposed to have been ignorant of the fundamental principles of the church of which he was a titular bishop or governor, the respected name of Dr. Cook[2] may carry some weight. In the conclusion of his history of the Reformation, he says decidedly, "They who have embraced episcopacy, although they are not averse to maintain that this book (the First Book of Discipline) *in fact sanctioned a form of prelacy*, would have preferred to that form an exact resemblance of the Church of England; while the successors of the first reformers, who afterwards embraced with so much zeal the exclusive and divine authority of the presbyterian model, *consider it as a stumbling-block*, which they are eager to remove. They have, accordingly, represented the institution of superintendents as not designed by Knox to continue in the church; and thus endeavour to gain to their principles his countenance and approbation. But the ground upon which they rest this assertion *is not sufficient to bear it.* It is apparent, from the manner in which Knox has spoken of the state of religion while superintendents were recognized,—from the uniformity with which *he inculcated deference and obedience* to the higher ecclesiastical powers,—and from the language used in the Acts of the successive Assemblies, in some of which superintendents are classed among the needful members of the church, that he was firmly persuaded that his plan

[1] See *post*, Chapter VII.

[2] Dr. Cook is now the leader of the *moderates* in the Kirk, who are opposed to the *non-intrusionists*.

ought to be permanent. That so far from being only a 'devout imagination,' as some of the nobility contemptuously characterised it, it was the *best plan* that presented itself to his mind."

The history of the Scottish reformation, or rather the destruction of the Scoto-papal church and the dissolution of religion, has now been brought down to the period when the protestant hierarchy of Knox received a parliamentary establishment. Without doubt the government which he and his associates projected, and which the noblemen at the head of affairs established, was episcopal; yet, with an inconsistency which would excite a jealousy of his sincerity, Knox utterly repudiated all consecration to the office of bishop or superintendent. As Knox had studied so long and so assiduously in the school of the Geneva patriarch, it may not be altogether uninteresting to ascertain what were the opinions of the leading Protestants of that age respecting the government of the church.

When the Scottish reformation was in progress, there was no such controversy any where agitated as the divine right of presbytery. The principal subjects of dispute were the papal supremacy, the immoral lives of the papal clergy, and certain corruptions in doctrine and discipline which had crept into the practice of the church. We hear nothing of presbyterian discipline for nearly twenty years after the establishment of the Knoxian episcopacy. Calvin, Knox's most intimate friend and adviser, was so far from approving of the system of presbytery, that he says, there is no anathema of which it is not worthy. In his treatise on the necessity of reforming the church, he replies to the objection made to the ordination by his disciples without bishops, by pleading *necessity*, because the papal bishops had refused to give any assistance; and says:—"If they will give us such an hierarchy, in which the bishops may be so above others as that they refuse not to be under Christ, and depend on him as the only head, and be referred unto Him; in which they so maintain brotherly fellowship among themselves, that they may be knit together no other way than by the truth; then I confess, if there be any that do not observe that hierarchy with the greatest reverence and obedience, *there is no curse of which they are not worthy*."

Calvin was a mere layman, and never was even in deacons' orders; yet he assumed a patriarchal position, dictated laws to most of those sects who have broken off from the church catholic, and even imposed his pernicious dogmas on many who were members of the church. It would have been happy

for the church's peace had he never been born; for he has created more divisions and uncharitable schisms in it, and sunk more souls into "wretchlessness of most unclean living," than any other leader of modern date, not even excepting the celebrated Hildebrand. It is a curious coincidence remarked by the author of a Letter on Lay-baptism Invalid, "that in the *same* year that Calvin made himself *pope* of his *lay cardinals*, that is, the lay elders, at Geneva, Ignatius Loyola got himself made superior of his own order, the Jesuits, at Rome. This was anno 1541: and these Jesuits have ever since been the Janizaries of the papacy, and the lay-elders the Janizaries of presbytery. And by the united malice of these two, just one hundred years after, was the church of England" (and of Scotland also) "overthrown and destroyed, anno 1641; so near akin are the Jesuits and Calvinists or Presbyterians, at least in their aversion to primitive apostolical episcopacy and in their politics." Extremes meet. As the papal church rejects all ordination as invalid, except it has been conferred by the pope or one "in the grace of the holy see," as they term it: so Calvin, Knox, and their followers, despised and rejected all ordination, albeit they did *admit* that it *was an apostolical ordinance*. This acknowledgment, and at the same time the rejection of the apostolical command, is exactly parallel with the sacrilege of the Council of Constance, where it was decreed that "*though Christ did institute* in both kinds, and the primitive church *did so administer; yet* WE DESIRE THE CONTRARY *to be observed.*"

Knox accordingly brushed away the venerable apostolical rite of the imposition of hands as an unnecessary ceremony, although an apostle has commanded all bishops to do it with caution, and not suddenly. Knox declared that albeit it was an apostolical usage, yet *he* judged it *not necessary*, and we have been gravely informed, in the year 1841, in a pamphlet written by an influential minister of the kirk, that the laying on of hands is still not considered necessary, but that it was originally complied with to gratify a whim of James VI., who it seems had odd notions about propriety, and that it is now only practised from custom!

Notwithstanding their rejection of ordination, and their compelling their ministers to climb over the wall, and would not allow them to enter by the door into the sheepfold, yet both Calvin and Knox were decided enemies to Presbyterian parity; the former of whom affirms, that "*equality* of ministers *breedeth strifes.*"

It is evident, therefore, that Calvin admits the superiority

of bishops over presbyters, and makes them more than mere moderators. Having reckoned up several degrees of bishops, archbishops, and patriarchs, though he dislikes the word *hierarchy*, by which the government under these degrees is called, as a word not used in Holy Scripture, yet he adds immediately afterwards,—"If yet we consider the *thing*, laying aside that *word*, we shall find that these ancient bishops had no mind to make any other form of government in the Church than that which our Lord had prescribed in his word;[1] for, says he, "*without this distinction strifes would arise.*" Treating of the first bishops, he cites Jerom's words to Evagrius,—"What does a bishop that a presbyter does not, the office of *ordination* excepted?" and adds, "Nevertheless, in another place, Jerom teaches how ancient the institution of bishops is; for he says, that at Alexandria, from Mark downwards, there was still a bishop[2]." Here Calvin asserts both the *antiquity* and the *succession* of the episcopal order, which, he rightly says, was the means of preventing strifes, and of preserving due subordination and discipline. And on the same subject he says, "Now we are to speak of bishops, who, I wish, would contend about the retaining of their office. We would willingly grant unto them, (meaning the Roman bishops), that they have a holy and excellent office, if they would rightly discharge it[3]." Here he calls that same episcopal office "holy and excellent," which his followers in Scotland have solemnly sworn to root out and extirpate as an *antichristian corruption*. In the 13th sect. of the same book, he affirms likewise, that the ancient episcopacy was delivered by the apostles, and conveyed to the succeeding fathers of the Church "by hand to hand from the apostles." On the text of Titus, i. 5, "For this cause left I *thee* in Crete, that *thou* shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and *ordain* elders (*presbyters*) in every city, as I had appointed *thee*;" he says, very justly, "We may learn from that text, that there was then not such an equality among the ministers of the Church, but that *one* person presided in authority and council above the rest." But, more decidedly still, in a long letter which he wrote to an old friend on his elevation to the office of a bishop in the Church of Rome, he says, "Episcopacy itself has *proceeded from God, and was instituted by God.*" And, a little after, he says, "In esteeming the *episcopal office*, we must not regard the *people's* judgment, but *God's only*, by whose authority it is constituted[4]." And throughout the whole of this epistle he never

[1] Instit. lib. iv. c. iv. sec. 4. [2] Ib. [3] Ib. c. v. sec. 11. [4] Opusc. p. 72.

insinuates the smallest objection to the office, but severely inveighs against the *abuses* of it in the Church of Rome, and advises his friend "either to do the duty of a bishop, or else to resign the bishop's seat."

The above, therefore, is a very decided testimony, from Calvin's own writings, of the divine institution of the episcopal office. He affirms that it is a holy and excellent office; that it is from God, and instituted by HIM; that to it belongs the power of ordination; and he strongly recommends the faithful discharge of its important duties. But these are not his only testimonies in its favour. In a long epistle to the Duke of Somerset, Protector of England during the minority of Edward VI., he offers his advice respecting many things in religion; yet it is very remarkable that he never once objects to, or recommends the removal of, the English episcopacy: but, on the contrary, he earnestly advises that both *bishops* and *priests* shall be sworn to preach no other doctrine than that which is contained in the Thirty nine Articles of religion. And in the same letter he says, "I hear there are two sorts of seditious persons who have elevated their head against the king and state of the kingdom; the first, a kind of heady and humourous people, who, under pretence of the gospel, would bring in confusion and disorder every where; the others are hardened in their antichristian superstitions: and those in authority should restrain both." Had Calvin entertained the opinion of ministerial *parity*, which has since been ascribed to him by those who implicitly follow his doctrinal opinions, he never would have suffered so favourable an opportunity to have escaped of recommending that novel measure, which he himself has characterised as a "breeder of strifes," and of insisting on its adoption. It is so much a matter of fact that the Church of England was then, as it is now, and ever has been since it was first planted by St. Paul, *episcopal*, that it is unnecessary to say he was addressing the civil governor of a church whose discipline was *not* that of Presbyterian parity. Therefore his *silence* must be construed as an *approval* of that ancient and only legitimate government, which was instituted by Jesus Christ, and has been handed down, as Calvin himself assures us, "by hand to hand from the apostles." And to those who look up to him as the father and founder of presbytery, and the greatest light of the Reformation, his opinion on this subject ought to carry considerable weight. In a letter to the King of Poland, he approved of all the degrees of the hierarchy, even to patriarchs. In his answer to Cartwright's

representation of archbishops and bishops, he uses nearly the same words:—"I had always a great reverence for the bishops of your Church, to whom *I gave inward reverence, as well as outward respect*, and would gladly have served them in settling of the English Church: and my judgment is, if we may have such an hierarchy, in which the bishops so excel others that they refuse not subjection to Christ, but would depend on him as their only Head, and refer themselves to him, in which they preserve brotherly communion among themselves, that they are united by nothing more than the truth; in which case, *I denounce him worthy of all curses* who does not observe such an hierarchy with all reverence and obedience; and *I would to God such a succession had continued to this day; it should easily have obtained from us the obedience that it deserves.* I do account the government by archbishops a moderate honour, as being within the compass of a man's power to execute, which the pope's pretended authority is not; and the ancient church did appoint patriarchs and primates in every province, as a bond to unite bishops in concord.

As many sincere well-disposed presbyterians are puzzled with the word *archbishop*, which they cannot find in the Holy Scriptures, any more than the presbyterian title of *moderator* is to be discovered by the strictest search, I may be allowed to inform them, that archbishops are not superior in order to other bishops, but only in jurisdiction. It is their privilege to confirm the election, and to consecrate the other bishops within their provinces—to summon the bishops to hold synods under them, in which they sit as presidents (or moderators)—to inquire into their opinions, and to censure them with suspension or deprivation, according to the nature of their mal-administration—also to hear and determine causes between contending bishops; but, within their own diocese, they possess no more spiritual power than any other bishop. Patriarchs are bishops claiming or exercising more extensive jurisdiction over their brother bishops; such as the patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, and Constantinople. Society cannot subsist without order and government; therefore Presbyterian moderators assume, for the time being, the powers and supremacy of an archbishop in their courts, in imitation of that hierarchy which Calvin approved, and his disciple Knox appointed, that, as the latter said, "All things in the Church might be carried with order, and well."

It is evident, therefore, that John Calvin was not an enemy to such an episcopacy as was exercised in the primitive

church, before the usurpation of the bishop of Rome in the seventh century, and which still exists in the reformed catholic churches of England and Ireland, the episcopal churches of Scotland, and of the United States of America; but only to the unscriptural, antichristian, and intolerable tyranny of the pope, who claims to be the universal bishop and head of the whole church. Jesus Christ is the only Head of the holy catholic and apostolic church; and it cannot be shewn that He ever delegated his authority as head over all things, to his church which is his body, to any man or set of men, whether pope or prelate, moderator or General Assembly, in any part of the world. He no more placed one universal bishop over all the churches, either at Rome or Geneva, than he appointed one universal monarch over all the kingdoms of the earth. Calvin was not an enemy to protestant episcopacy; because it is the strongest possible defence against popery, as every bishop is an independent prince in his own diocese, from whom there is no appeal, and who prevents those "strifes" which he said "equality among ministers breedeth." Calvin pleaded necessity for his departure from the apostolical order, because at Geneva he could not then have had episcopal ordination, jurisdiction, and protection, without first swearing allegiance and obedience to the pope, and consequently of continuing in all the errors of popery. This necessity could not have been pleaded in Scotland; for although only one of the bishops[1] really shook off his connexion with Rome, yet they might have received canonical consecration in England then as well as they afterwards did. The English bishops, having thrown off the

[1] There were three of the bishops became Protestant, and which is a canonical number to have kept up and continued the succession; but one only of them was ever consecrated. Alexander Gordon, bishop of Galloway, was consecrated to the bishopric of the Isles in 1553, and translated to Galloway in 1558. He married, and had a son, to whom he conveyed all the lands belonging to the see, and which was afterwards confirmed by charter under the great seal. "Thus," says Bishop Keith, "went the ecclesiastical benefices in that period." James Hamilton, bastard brother of the Duke of Chatelherault, was put into the see of Argyle in 1558, and made sub-dean of Glasgow in commendam. "*There is no certainty of his ever having been consecrated.*" He turned Protestant at the reformation; and at the parliament, or rather convention, in the year 1560, we find him on that side: but there is nothing else heard of him, except that he signs a bond with his other relations for setting the Queen at liberty *anno* 1567." Robert Stewart was preferred to the see of Caithness, in 1542, when *a mere youth*: and having joined his brother the Earl of Lennox, in the feud with the Earl of Arran, he was forfeited, and lived abroad for twenty-two years. On his return, "he turned with the times, and became Protestant, but still bore the title of Bishop of Caithness, and enjoyed the revenues till his death. After the death of the regent Moray, and the accession of his brother the Earl of Lennox, to that supreme office, he got a gift of the priory of St. Andrews, which he afterwards retained all his life."—*Keith's Catalogue of Scottish Bishops.*

supremacy of the pope, and abjured all the errors of popery, restored that church to its original purity, simplicity, and independence; whence the church of Scotland derived its orders in the reign of James VI., but which was destroyed, root and branch, in the reign of his pious successor. It again derived its orders from the same source in the reign of the second Charles, and it still continues to subsist, like a bush burning yet not consumed. It is to such an episcopacy as this that Calvin recommended obedience, and utterly condemned those who would not submit themselves to its easy and gentle government. Durell is of opinion that "the juncture of affairs brought it (parity among ministers) to the doors of those churches where it was taken in and maintained; and that it was a government, not of choice, *but of necessity*[1]."

Although Beza, who succeeded to Calvin in the chair of Geneva, distinguishes bishops into divine, human, and satanical, yet he writes with the greatest respect of the episcopacy of the church of England; of which he says, "May England indeed enjoy that goodness of God which I wish may be *perpetual* unto her; much less that we (which they object to us most falsely and impudently) prescribe to any church our peculiar example to be followed, like these unskilful persons who think nothing right but what they do themselves: let them enjoy this (meaning episcopacy) who will and can[2]." And again, he says, "But God forbid that I should find fault with the order (of bishops), albeit apostolical, and not established by mere divine appointment, as if it had been rashly and proudly brought in; yea, who can deny that it was of great use and benefit, while good and holy bishops were over the churches?" In his letter to Archbishop Whitgift, dated 8th of March, 1591, he says: "In my writings I ever impugned the Romish hierarchy, but never intended to touch or impugn the polity of the church of England, or to exact of you to form yourselves to our pattern." To Grindall, bishop of London, he writes: "How much greater punishment shall they deserve who shall contemn thy authority? —Jesus keep thee and govern thee by his Holy Spirit, and confirm thee more and more in *that so great office committed to thee.* God hath appointed thee a *watchman* and *a judge*." But more particularly, when disputing with Saravia, he alleges, "*If there are any (as I hardly believe there are) who reject all the order of bishops, God FORBID that any man of a SOUND MIND should assent to their MADNESS.*"

[1] Durell's View of Government.
[2] De Min. Grad. c. 18, 21.

At the Synod of Dort, when the Bishop of Llandaff, who was sent there on the part of England by James VI., had in a speech highly commended the episcopal government of the church, the president of that synod returned him an answer in the name of the other members: "My lord, you have said well, but we are not so happy."

After Salmasius had written in defence of presbytery, he declared in his answer to Milton, cited by Durell, "That having observed how confusions and strange errors sprang up in England, immediately after the bishops were removed, he had changed his mind. That, being taught by experience, as the following day is teacher of the former, he had changed his opinion." Durell also shows, that David Blondel concluded his apology for Jerom in these words: "By all that we have said to assert the rights of Presbytery, it is *not our purpose to invalidate the ancient and* APOSTOLICAL *institutions of* EPISCOPAL *pre-eminency*, but we judge, that where it is established conformable to the ancient canons, *it must be carefully preserved;* and when by some heat of contention or otherwise, it hath been put down or violated, *it ought to be reverently restored.*" But by the importunity of some, whose views this remarkable sentence did not suit, he was prevailed on to expunge it at the press. In proof of this Durell produces a letter of Peter du Moulin, wherein he shows that Blondel acknowledged the allegation to be true.

John Knox never once condemned the office of a bishop: on the contrary, he set up superintendents or commissioners, "that all things in the church might be carried with order and well;" and at the admission of Spottiswood to be superintendent or overseer of Lothian, he presided and preached the sermon, and recommended obedience to his office, alleging that the superintendents were not only expedient, but absolutely necessary. On that occasion he tells us in his history, "First was made a sermon, in which these heads were handled: *First*, the *necessity* of ministers *and superintendents, or overseers, &c* The sermon being ended, it was declared by the *same* minister, maker thereof, (John Knox to wit), that the lords of the Secret Council had given charge and power to the churches of Lothian to choose Mr. John Spottiswood superintendent or overseer. . . . . After was called the said John, who answering, the minister (Knox) demanded, if any man knew any crime or offence to the said Mr. John that might prevent him from being called to *that office*. . . . . The people were asked if they would have the said Mr. John as superintendent or over-

seer? If they would honour and *obey* him as Christ's minister, and comfort and assist him in every thing pertaining to his charge?" The consent of the people was the whole of his consecration to this office of a Knoxian bishop; the apostolic ceremony of the laying on of hands having been dispensed with. In the prayer which followed, the chief minister, Knox, who was of an inferior degree to him whom he attempted to make a bishop, says; ". . . . hast appointed in thy church *teachers*, *pastors*, and *APOSTLES* to instruct, comfort, and admonish the same. Look upon us mercifully, O Lord; thou that only art king, teacher, and high priest of thine own flock; and send unto this our brother, whom, in thy name, we have charged with the *chief care* of thy church within the bounds of Lothian, such portion of thy Holy Spirit," &c. The prayer ended, the rest of the ministers, if any be, and elders of that church present, in sign of their consent, shall take the elected by the hand: and in the last exhortation to the elected, Knox said, "Usurp not dominion, nor tyrannical authority, over thy brethren:" a piece of advice which is altogether incompatible with a system of parity.

When John Douglas was admitted archbishop of St. Andrews, John Knox preached the sermon,—a decided proof of his approbation of the office; and Spottiswood says of Knox, in summing up his life, "that he was far from those dotages wherein some that would have been thought his followers did afterwards fall; for never was any man more observant of church authority than he, *always urging the obedience of MINISTERS to their SUPERINTENDENTS*, for which he caused divers acts to be made in the Assemblies of the Church, and showed himself severe to the transgressors." In the parliament of 1560, Knox designates the prelates who had separated from the communion of Rome, as those who "had *renounced papistry, and openly professed Jesus Christ WITH US*." And his letter to the bishops of the Church of England, written at the desire and in the name of the General Assembly, is addressed—"The *superintendents*, *ministers*, and commissioners of the Church within the realm of Scotland, *to their brethren the bishops and pastors* of England who have renounced the Roman antichrist, and do profess, with them, the Lord Jesus in sincerity, wish the increase of the Holy Spirit." Here are the bishops and pastors, or the superintendents and ministers of one church, addressing as their brethren those of another church and kingdom, who, without controversy, were, and always have been, of the

same episcopal principles. But, in corroboration of these stubborn matters of fact, we have the evidence of the First Book of Discipline, composed by Knox and those who afterwards themselves became bishops, laying down a "good and godly polity," "*to continue for all time coming*;" but which, nevertheless, was set aside by the Presbyterian party when they overturned the Knoxian Church. From which, and many Acts of Assembly, no less than thirty marks of superiority have been collected, as pertaining to the office of a superintendent or bishop[1].

There is not an instance on record of any of the first reforming clergy or laity having impugned the episcopal office, or of even having called its just authority and jurisdiction in question. On his trial, Wishart did not express any dissatisfaction, or start any objection that his judges were bishops, which he undoubtedly would have done, had he considered their order to have been "an antichristian corruption." On the contrary, he not only gave them their full titles, and showed them all the respect and deference due to their superior place, as bishops and judges; but, in his final exhortation to the people at the very stake, he entreated them to obey and respect their bishops: "I beseech you, brethren and sisters," said he, "to exhort your prelates to the learning of the word of God, that they may be ashamed to do evil, and learn to do good[2]." He was earnest that the Romish bishops should abjure their errors, and reform their scandalous lives, of which they had too much need; but he does not advise them to abjure their offices, nor the people to reject them. In short, it is impossible to produce the slightest evidence of any of our reformers, either of those excellent men who were added "to the noble army of martyrs," or of those who afterwards settled the church and drew up her code of discipline, being enemies to *prelacy, but only to popery*. They never condemned bishops as such, but only as *popish* bishops, or, as Knox called them, "the generation of antichrist."

At the period of our reformation there was not the slightest objection offered to set forms of prayer; Knox's history is full of occasional prayers, composed by him; the public service of the church was by a set form of prayer; and the prayer-book set forth by Edward VI. of England was the form in universal use.

Sir John Borthwick was charged by the Inquisition with maintaining "that the doctrines of the church of England,

[1] See *ante*, pages 112-118. [2] Knox.

and especially her Liturgy, were good and commendable, and worthy to be embraced by all Christians; and that the Church of Scotland ought to be governed after the manner of England." And John Rough, who suffered martyrdom for the Church of England, asserted on his trial "that he had read the prayers of the Communion Book, set forth in the reign of Edward VI., and that he did approve of it, as agreeing in all points with the word of God." From which it is evident, that they approved of set forms of prayer in general, and of the English liturgy in particular; and that the whole stress of what is now called worship did not at that time rest on *preaching*, for this pious martyr esteemed *reading prayers* to be of infinitely more importance than the vain-glorious talent of preaching. In extemporary worship, preaching comprehends almost the whole of the public service, and which has become the idol of those who have been smitten with "itching ears," to the unspeakable injury of true religion, and the encouragement of vanity and ostentation in the preacher. The First Book of Discipline contains an order, that "In great towns, we think it expedient that every day there be either sermon or common prayer, with some exercise of reading the Scriptures." It is also clear, that Knox individually preferred a liturgical service in the worship of God. He entertained objections to the English Service Book, and therefore employed the influence which he possessed over his brethren to introduce in place of it the liturgy used at Geneva, and which, in consequence, has been frequently called by his name, as well as known by the title of the "Old Scottish Liturgy." We are informed by Spottiswood that he had set forms of prayer read every day to his family; and Richard Bannatyne, his servant, secretary, or amanuensis, tells us in his journal, that his master continued to the last to conduct his private devotions according to the ritual of the church; and that, a few hours before he expired, he repeated aloud the Lord's Prayer and the Belief. And every day he read a certain chapter in both the Old and New Testament, with certain psalms, "whilk psalms he passed through everie moneth once[1]."

There is no doubt but that, under God, the Scottish reformation was cherished and protected by English influence. Most of those men who had been the chief instruments in preaching and planting the doctrines of the reformation had imbibed their principles in the Church of England, and had brought them thence to Scotland. Wishart had studied in Cambridge.

[1] Cited in Scottish Ep. Mag. ii. 31.

John Spottiswood, the first superintendent or bishop of Lothian, was one of Cranmer's disciples,—"was, by his means, brought to a knowledge of the truth;" John Willock, and William Harley, were both natives of England; the former was a priest of that church; and John Knox himself was a priest of the Church of England,—was offered a bishopric in it, and his two sons were educated at the University of Cambridge, and became priests of the Church of England. In conformity with the English influence and alliance, our reformers were of exactly the same principles in doctrine and discipline as the Church of England, and held the same common articles of the Christian faith. They unanimously considered the Church of England to be so well constituted, that it was lawful to join in her communion, and which they invariably did when their affairs required their residence within her jurisdiction.

There is not any evidence, in any author of the period now under consideration, to show that the two churches of England and Scotland had opposite communions, till many years after the reformation, when Andrew Melville introduced an entirely new polity. Our reformers lived in communion with the Church of England; many of whom officiated and were settled in her parish churches, and some of them suffered martyrdom for her, confessing and glorying in their attachment to her doctrine and discipline. In their public deeds they openly and solemnly confessed that they were of one religion and one communion with the Church of England. When the lords of the Congregation found it necessary to solicit foreign assistance to expel the French, who were the great obstacles to the establishment of the reformation, they resolved in the first place to apply to England. Knox says: "We thought good to seek aid and support of all christian princes against her (the queen regent's) tyranny, in case we should be more sharply pursued, and because that England was of the *same religion*." Secretary Cecil replied to their application, "that their enterprise misliked not the English council." This comfortable assurance was answered by the lords of the Congregation, which, abridged from Knox, is, "They perceive their messenger, Master Kirkaldy of Grange, hath found Cecil an unfeigned favourer of Christ's true religion. As touching the assurance of a perpetual amity to stand betwixt the two realms, as no earthly thing is more desired by them, so they crave of God to be made the instruments by which the unnatural debate which has long continued between

the nations, may be composed, to the praise of God's name, and *the comfort of the faithful in both nations*. Their confederacy, amity, and league, shall not be like the pactions made by worldly men for worldly profit, but, as they require it, for God's cause, so they will call upon his name for the observation of it. . . . . Given at Edinburgh, 17th July, 1559." This confederacy "for God's cause"—this "godly conjunction"—could be for no other purpose than for an union of the churches; that as the English reformation was perfected, and that church legally established, the Scottish, which was only in progress, might also be established on the same principles, and engage to receive the doctrine, worship, rites, and government of the Church of England, so that there might be no difference in the constitution of the two churches, so far as the distinction of the two states would allow. We have Buchanan's word for the truth of this "godly conjunction;" and in a matter of this sort his evidence is of the greatest importance. He narrates the circumstance ten years afterwards. "The Scots," he says, "some years before, being delivered from Gallican slavery by the English assistance, *had subscribed to the religious worship and rites of the Church of England;* and that surprising change in affairs seemed to promise to Britain quietness and rest from all intestine commotions and factions[1]." Here Buchanan plainly asserts a matter of fact, which his authority is alone sufficient to establish, although there were no other evidence of a "godly conjunction" between the churches; and in consequence, what was more natural than that the English Book of Common Prayer should also be the common prayer of the people of Scotland? It accordingly is on record that such was the fact. In the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, published in the reign of Charles I. the compilers, who lived when the knowledge of this circumstance must have been familiar to them, say—"Our first reformers were of the same mind with us, as appeareth by the ordinance they made, that in all the parishes of the realm the common prayer should be read weekly on Sundays and other festival days, with the lessons of the Old and New Testament, conform to the order of the Book of Common Prayer (meaning that of England); for it is known that divers years after, we had no other order for common prayer. This is recorded to have been the first head concluded in a frequent council of the lords and barons pro-

[1] Buchanan, cited in Fundamental Charter of Presbytery.

fessing Jesus Christ. We keep the words of history—'Religion was not then placed in rites and gestures, nor men taken with the fancy of extemporary prayer[1].'"

Knox has recorded the prayer of thanksgiving composed by himself, and inserted in the history that goes under his name, after the pacification at Leith, July 1560, which decidedly demonstrates the friendly relation between the churches which happily subsisted at that time, and is a complete demonstration of Buchanan's assertion to the same effect already quoted. The following makes a part of the thanksgiving prayer:—"Seeing that nothing is so odious in thy presence, O Lord, than is ingratitude and violation of an oath and covenant made in thy name; and seeing thou hast made our confederates in England the instruments by whom we are now set at this liberty, and to whom, in thy name, we have *promised mutual faith again*, let us never fall to that unkindness, O Lord, that either we declare ourselves unthankful unto them, or profaners of thy holy name. Confound the counsel of those that go about to break that *most godly league contracted in thy name*; and retain thou us so firmly together, by the power of thy Holy Spirit, that Satan have no power to set us again at discord. Give us grace to live in that christian charity which thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, hath so earnestly commended to all the members of his body, that other nations, provoked by our example, may set aside all ungodly war, contention, and strife, and study to live in tranquillity and peace, as it becometh the sheep of thy pasture, and the people that do daily look for our final deliverance by the coming again of our Lord Jesus[2]." And farther: in the Old Scottish Liturgy there is a thanksgiving after deliverance from the tyranny of the French, wherein it is prayed, "Grant unto us, O Lord, that with such reverence we may remember thy benefits received, that, after this, in our default, we never enter into hostility against the realm and nation of England. Suffer us never, O Lord, to fall to that ingratitude and detestable unthankfulness, that we should seek the destruction and death of those whom thou hast made instruments to deliver us from the tyranny of merciless strangers. Dissipate thou the counsels of such as deceitfully travail to stir the hearts of the inhabitants of either realm against the other. Let their merciless practices be their own confusion; and grant thou, of thy mercy, that love, concord,

[1] Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, compiled for the use of the Church of Scotland, anno 1632.

[2] Knox's History, 228.

and tranquillity, may continue and increase amongst the inhabitants of this isle, even to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whose glorious gospel, thou, of thy mercy, dost call us both to *unity, peace, and christian concord*, the full perfection whereof we shall possess in the fulness of thy kingdom."

It appears sufficiently clear from this, that our reformers, at the period when the protestant religion was established as that of the state, held the same doctrine, discipline, and common prayers, as the Church of England; that, in short, there was such a "godly conjunction,"—"most godly league," —such "unity, peace, and christian concord," between the churches, as amounted to an union. But, above all, we have Buchanan's testimony for the fact, that "*the Scots subscribed to the religious worship and rites of the Church of England.*" Here we have in reality a confederacy, an oath, or union, between the protestant churches of England and Scotland. The Church of England has remained the same, without the least change. That of Scotland has made many changes, and has since recorded her vow to *extirpate* the Church of England; but it is undeniable, that, at this period, the Church of Scotland used daily the Common Prayer of the Church of England, and maintained a friendly relation with her.

It also appears that the Scottish reformers preferred a public set form of prayer to a conceived or extemporary form. John Knox, who had as much animal heat as any man of that day, used in the public service the Common Prayer Book of the Church of England, which continued to be used for seven years after the reformation, when he prevailed with his brethren to substitute the order of Geneva, since generally known by the name of *Knox's Liturgy*, or the *Old Scottish Liturgy*. This liturgy continued in use, not only during all the period while superintendents governed the church, but for many years after presbytery was introduced. It was so universally received and used, and it was held in such high esteem, that when some men, excited by extemporary eloquence, moved in the Assembly held at Burntisland, 1601, "that there were sundry prayers in it which were not convenient for these times," and that a change was desirable, the Assembly rejected the motion, and "thought good that the prayers already contained in the book should neither be altered nor deleted; but if any preacher would have any other prayers added, as more proper for the times, they should first present them to be tried by the General Assembly[1]." Even so late as the beginning of the seven-

[1] Pet.—Cald.—cited in Fund. Charter of Presbytery.

teenth century, we have instances of caution and concern about the public worship, worthy of the collective wisdom of the National Church, than which nothing more decidedly shows the prevalence of a liturgical service. Even the most stubborn and intractable of the presbyterians used Knox's liturgy as regularly as those did who were of episcopal principles. Robert Bruce, one of the most dogmatic and insolent men of his age, when banished to Inverness for his seditious conduct, anno 1605, and where he remained in disgrace four years, "taught every Sunday before noon, and every Wednesday, and *exercised at the* READING OF THE PRAYERS *every other night.*" When John Scrimgeour, another champion of presbytery, was cited before the court of High Commission, 1620, and was challenged for neglecting the Five Articles of Perth, but particularly for not having administered the eucharist to his congregation on their knees, he answered, "there is no warrantable *form* directed or approven by the kirk BESIDES *that which is extant in print, before the Psalm Book* (that is, Knox's Liturgy), *according to which, as I have always done, so now I minister that sacrament*[1]." In short, a liturgy continued partially in use by episcopalians and presbyterians indifferently, even after the beginning of the revolution in church and state in King Charles I.'s time; and Bishop Sage says, that "many old people then alive (in 1690) remember to have seen it used by both parties."

The following are extracts from some of the prayers in the old Scottish liturgy[2], *wherein the Lord's Prayer was never omitted.*

The prayer for the *whole estate of Christ's Church*, appointed to be said after sermon, concluded with—"In whose name we make our humble petitions unto thee, even as he has taught us, saying, OUR FATHER," &c. Another prayer, to be said after sermon, has the Lord's Prayer in the very centre of it.

The prayer to be used when *God threatens his judgments*, concludes, "Praying unto thee with all humility and submission of mind, as we are taught and commanded to pray, saying, *Our Father*," &c.

The prayer to be used in *times of affliction* ends, "Our only Saviour and Mediator, in whose name we pray unto thee as we are taught, saying, *Our Father*," &c.

The prayer at the admission (ordination) of a superintendent

[1] Calderwood.

[2] A new edition of this Liturgy has been published in London, edited by the Rev. Mr. Cumming, a presbyterian minister.

or minister:—"Of whom the perpetual increase of thy grace we crave, as by thee, our Lord and only Bishop, we are taught to pray, *Our Father*," &c.

The prayer for *the obstinate*, (in the order for excommunication):—"These thy graces, O Heavenly Father, and farther as thou knowest to be expedient for us, and for thy Church universal, we call for unto thee, even as we are taught by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, saying, *Our Father*," &c.

The last prayer before excommunication:—"This we ask of thee, O Heavenly Father, in the boldness of our Head and Mediator, Jesus Christ, praying, as he has taught us, saying, *Our Father*," &c.

The confession of sins in times of public fasting:—"We flee to the obedience and fearful justice of Jesus Christ, our only Mediator, praying as he has taught us, saying, *Our Father*," &c.

The prayer of consecration in baptism:—"May be brought, as a lively member of his body, unto the full fruition of thy joys in the heavens, where thy Son, our Saviour Christ, reigneth, world without end; in whose name we pray, as he has taught us, saying, *Our Father*," &c.

Here is sufficient evidence that the Scottish reformers made use of set forms of prayer; but, above all, that they constantly used that most excellent prayer, the perfect rule of our desires, which was left by our blessed Lord as a sacred legacy to his Church; and which ought never to be omitted, as it is much to be feared that our prayers will not be acceptable at the throne of grace when it is proudly rejected. In conformity with the universal Church, they always made public confession of their faith, by rehearsing the Apostles' Creed every time they met for public worship; and which was repeated immediately after the prayer for *the whole estate of Christ's Church*, with this introductory petition:—"Almighty and everlasting God, vouchsafe, we beseech thee, to grant us perfect continuance in thy lively faith, augmenting the same in us daily, till we grow to the full measure of our perfection in Christ, whereof we make our confession, saying, *I believe in God the Father*," &c.

In the Knoxian Church the Holy Scriptures were daily read; and in the First Book of Discipline (head 9) the following order to that effect is recorded:—"We think necessary that every church have a Bible in English, and that the people convene to hear the Scriptures read and interpreted; *that, by frequent reading and hearing, the gross ignorance of the people may be removed.* And we judge it most expedient, that the scriptures be read in order; that is, some one book of the Old

and New Testaments be begun and followed forth to the end." The *reader* was one of the three orders of the ministry, whose office was to supply the want of ministers, and to read the Scriptures and the Common Prayers. The Scriptures continued to be read in churches upwards of eighty years after the reformation; and even the Directory itself, in the present Westminster Confession, appoints the Scriptures to be publicly read, in order "for the edifying of the people;" but which, being left to the discretion of the minister, is now almost entirely neglected.

Rules are laid down in the first Book of Discipline for the time and nature of preaching: "The *Sunday*, in all towns, must precisely be observed, before and after noon; *before* noon *the Word must be preached*, sacraments administered, &c.; *afternoon the catechism must be taught*, and the young children examined thereon, in audience of all the people." This custom of alternate preaching and catechising continued, for more than twenty years, to be observed in the public worship; and the first notice of any change in the custom, that is, of abolishing catechising (which is the best of all possible modes of preaching), and introducing a sermon in the afternoon, is in that Assembly which condemned episcopacy in the year 1580. It was then ordained "that all pastors or ministers should diligently travel with their flocks to convene unto afternoon sermon on Sunday, both they that are in landward and in burgh, as they shall answer unto God[1]."

The reformed Knoxian church, under the government of superintendents, used several hymns in public worship. Besides the Psalms of David, the *Veni Creator*, the Humble Suit of a Sinner, the *Magnificat*, or Song of the blessed Virgin, also, the *Nunc dimittis*, or Old Simeon's Song, were sung, and the psalms and hymns were always concluded with the *Gloria Patri*. As before mentioned, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments, were repeated every Lord's Day in the public worship of the church,—than which nothing can better preserve the faith and morality of any people. Bishop Burnet published an authentically attested letter, which he found among his uncle Johnston of Warriston's papers, which notices, among other signs of the times, the disuse of these solemn and laudable practices. "When some designers," says he, "for popularity in the western parts of that kirk, did begin to disuse the Lord's Prayer in worship, and the singing the conclusion or doxology after the psalm, and the

[1] Petrie, p. 404, cited in Fundamental Charter.

minister's kneeling for private devotions when he entered the pulpit, the General Assembly took this in very ill part, and in the letter they wrote to the presbyteries, complained sadly that a spirit of innovation was beginning to get into the kirk, and to throw these laudable practices out of it." Beside these "laudable practices," our reformers required sponsors or godfathers in baptism, as well as the father of the child. In the office for baptism in the Old Liturgy, the minister, addressing the father and sponsors, said, "finally, to the intent, that you the father and the sureties consent to the performance hereof, and declare here before the face of this congregation the sum of that faith wherein you believe and will instruct this child:" and here followed the apostles' creed.

The old or Knox's liturgy contained a set form for the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and the First Book of Discipline enacts, "that this sacrament shall be administered "four times in the year." The rubric in Knox's liturgy intimates a more frequent communion: "Upon the day that the Lord's Supper is ministered, which commonly is used once a month." There were not any assistant ministers in those days, neither was that practice introduced till 1645. The Confession of Faith composed by Knox and his coadjutors being established as the national standard, nothing more burdensome was required for qualifying private persons for the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, than that "they could say the Lord's Prayer, the articles of the Belief, and the Ten Commandments, and understood the use and virtue of this holy sacrament[1]."

At the period of the reformation, therefore, a set form of prayer was in daily use, and that form was first the Prayer-Book of Edward VI., and afterwards the old Scottish or Knoxian liturgy. Extemporary prayers did not come in by authority till after the introduction of presbytery, which was not accomplished till 1580. Our Saviour has annexed a promise to public prayer on a certain condition, with which, in extemporary prayers, it is impossible to comply; and therefore it is to be feared that the promise may not be fulfilled: "Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall *agree* on earth touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." It cannot be doubted that this gracious promise belongs to public prayers, such as are made by several persons, but at the least by *two;* and it is plain also, that it is to such public prayers, where two or more persons *shall agree*

[1] First Book of Discipline, ix.—Fundamental Charter of Presbytery generally.

together beforehand as to what they shall ask; or, in other words, to a national precomposed liturgy. But when the minister prays extempore, no matter how many people hear him, it is impossible that any two can agree together touching any thing that he shall ask; for no man knows what the minister will ask, and cannot therefore *agree to it beforehand*, and perhaps not afterwards. But a minister who prays extempore, though never so well, is "as a barbarian" to his hearers; he might as well lock up his prayers in a dead language, which St. Paul condemns. They may, perhaps, "agree" to it *after* they have heard the extemporary prayer; but that is by no means the condition which the promise requires, for it is given only to those who "agree" *beforehand* "what they shall ask," and consequently it requires a previous consent. Those who use a national precomposed liturgy keep close to the *condition* of the promise; they ask for nothing but what they have agreed on beforehand touching what they shall ask, and therefore have the sure and certain ground of God's promise to believe that their prayers will be heard, "and that it shall be done for them of his Father which is in heaven."

It is much to be lamented that John Knox did not appear to think it necessary to preserve the apostolical succession; for it cannot be denied that the church planted by him was *entirely deficient of orders*. Succession, "by hand to hand from the apostles," is the divine charter of the christian church, and the apostolical office is handed down by *consecration*, as the Aaronical priesthood was by hereditary succession. St. Chrysostom maintains, that the ordination of those who assume the ministerial character, without ordination from a bishop, is null and void: for, says he—"But do you think it sufficient to say that they are orthodox and *sound in the faith*? Suppose they are; yet still their ordination *is null and invalid*, and then what can their faith signify? Christians ought to *contend as earnestly for* VALID ORDINATION *as they do for their very* FAITH *itself*; for if it be lawful for every pretender to consecrate and make themselves priests, then farewell *altar*, *church*, and *priesthood* too[1]."

Knox has not left us in any doubt that those "certain zealous men who took upon them to preach" were altogether deficient of the power of conferring orders; for he says expressly, "before there was any public face of true religion within this realm, it pleased God, of his great mercy, to illuminate the hearts of many private persons, so that they did perceive and understand

[1] St. Chrysostom, tom. iii. p. 822, edit. Saville.

the abuses that were in the papistical church, and thereupon withdrew themselves from participation of their idolatry. And because the Spirit of God will never suffer his own to be idle and void of all religion, men began to exercise themselves in reading of the Scriptures secretly within their own houses; and variety of persons could not be kept in good obedience and honest fame, without overseers, elders, and deacons; and *so began* that small flock to put themselves in such order as if Christ plainly triumphed in the midst of them by the power of his gospel. And *they did elect* some to occupy the *supreme place of exhortation and reading;* some to be *elders* and helpers unto them, for the overseeing of the flock; and some to be *deacons*, for the collection of alms to be distributed to the poor of their own body. *Of this small beginning is that order which now God of his great mercy has given unto us publicly within this realm*[1]."

The following extract of a letter from Archbishop Hamilton to the Archbishop of Glasgow, who was then at Paris, dated the 18th of August, 1560, shows the violent intrusion of the protestant ministers into sacred offices, and their unchristian conduct towards the papal clergy:—"But one thing is, that so long as the new preachers are tholed (tolerated) *who are not admitted by the ordinary*, but *come in by force*, or are taken in by towns at their own hands, so that they will not allow any manner of service in the kirk but by themselves, and utterly oppose all others, bishops, abbots, parsons, vicars, who will not use all things of their manner as they prescribe: therefore your lordship must be diligent for remedy of thir (these) things; and as reason would, that no alteration were made of God's service, either in singing or saying of mass, matins, using of preachings and sacraments, against both the prelate's wills, and such like, against the people's own wills. But it might be sufficient to any that would be of this new opinion to use their own conscience with themselves, and not to cummir (frighten) others, to bost (threaten) them or banish them the country without they do such like; or, at the least, to hold all their benefices and livings from them. And also, it is shewn that they, without the consent of the bishops, will put into every kirk ministers to preach and use the sacraments in their manner, and debar all others. And thir preachers are *so seditious*, that I believe there will be little obedience to authority so long as they have place. . . . . There is none of this new band has will either to speak or accompany with any of us. . . . . All thir new

[1] Knox, p. 251.

preachers persuade openly the nobility in the pulpit *to put violent hands and slay all kirkmen* that will not concur and take their opinions, and openly reproach my lord duke that he will not begin first, and either cause me to do as they do, or else to use the rigour on me *by slaughter, sword*, or, at least, perpetual imprisonment: and with time, if they be tholed (suffered), no man may have life but without they grant their articles; *which I will not.* Therefore provide a remedy. I pray your lordship to make my commendation to all noblemen of our acquaintance of French, being at court, and my lord Seton.

"Your lordship at all power,

"J. SANCTANDROIS."

The want of canonical consecration was an evil which completely destroyed the spiritual character of the superintendent or Knoxian church; for, in the language of the apostolic age, the bishop represented the person of Christ, and the presbyters and deacons were subject to their bishops, as the apostles were to Christ, who is called an apostle by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews; and the laity were subject to their bishops and presbyters, "as those who had the rule over them," as these were to Christ. It was likewise then maintained, that whoever was in communion with his bishop was thereby in communion with Christ the Head; and whoever was not in communion with the bishop was *cut off* from communion with Christ; and that the sacraments, when administered without the bishop's authority and communion, were not only ineffectual, but provocation and rebellion against the Lord, like the offerings of Korah, or the sacrifice of Cain. In Keith's catalogue of Scottish bishops we have the names and succession of the bishops from the earliest antiquity; and in every Christian country the succession can be traced upwards to the fountain head,—Jesus Christ and his apostles. But these "zealous men" assumed to themselves the places of overseers, (bishops) elders, (presbyters) and deacons; and, doubtless, they cannot be acquitted of the guilt of Korah, which, the apostle St. Jude says, may be committed in the Christian as well as in the Jewish church.

Jesus Christ himself did not undertake his priesthood without an *outward* call and public consecration or anointing by a voice from heaven: "And lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God, descending like a dove and lighting upon him: and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, *this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*" Therefore the call to the priesthood must be *outward* and by authority, and not by the voice of the people, which is often the reverse of truth. Con-

viction was given to the outward senses of the assembled multitudes, and He who was ordained a priest from all eternity did not execute any part of his priestly office on earth till *after* his commission was proclaimed by the VOICE of GOD from heaven, at His baptism, in the audience of the people, when the Holy Spirit visibly descended on Him in the shape of a dove. *After* being thus *publicly and divinely commissioned* from heaven, the inspired apostle informs us, "*Jesus began to preach.*" St. Paul says, "No man taketh this honour upon himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest." If He who had so long before been "called a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec," and in whom dwelt the "fulness of the Godhead bodily," did not take upon himself the honour of the priesthood *without an outward and visible call from God*, what must be the guilt of those who, without any outward call by those who had authority to send labourers into the vineyard, took upon them, *by election of the people*, to assume the offices of "overseers, elders, and deacons!"

When Andrew Melville was occupied in preparing his "plot for a presbytery," he applied for assistance to Theodore Beza, Calvin's successor at Geneva, who wrote a tract, wherein he distinguished episcopacy into three kinds—*divine*, *human*, and *satanical*. He attributed to what *he* called *human* episcopacy, but which is of apostolic origin, not only a priority of order, but a superiority of power and authority over presbyters, bounded by laws and canons for the prevention of tyranny. Beza clearly acknowledges, that of this kind of episcopacy is to be understood whatever we read concerning the authority of bishops or presidents, in Ignatius, and other more ancient writers. Therefore, we assert that if Christ delegated his power to his apostles; and they to others, to continue to the end of the world; if the apostles delegated bishops under them, in all the Christian churches in the world in the apostolic age, and which continued for fifteen centuries; if it was not possible for churches so dispersed, in so many far distant regions, to concert all together and at once to *alter* the frame of government which had been left by the apostles; if such an alteration of government could not be accomplished without great notice being taken of it, as if the government of a nation was changed from democracy to monarchy; if no author or historian of those times makes the least mention of any such change of government, but all with one voice speak of episcopacy, and the succession of the bishops in all the churches, from the days of the apostles; and in those ages of zeal, when the

christians were so forward to sacrifice their lives in opposition to any error or deviation from the truth; if no one takes any notice of episcopacy as being an encroachment on the rights of presbyters or the people, or a deviation from the apostolical institution; if these things are not possible to any thinking man, then episcopacy must be the primitive and apostolical institution. 'And it is as impossible to be otherwise, as to suppose that all the great monarchies in the world should be turned into republics, or the republics into monarchies, all at one instant; or, that the whole world should go to bed as presbyterians, and rise up as episcopalians, and yet that nobody should know it, or that the historians of those times should take no notice of it; or any man could be found to assert his liberty and freedom against such a flagrant usurpation; or, that none of those who had the government before, should complain of any wrong done them, or set up their claims. If presbytery, or any other form of government, except episcopacy, had been the primitive apostolical institution, the bishops could never have stolen themselves into possession, and usurped the government in all churches throughout the world, without some notice, and without vast struggles, either by the honest or the ambitious. The change of the church government in Scotland, from modified episcopacy to presbytery, in the end of this century, was not effected without the most violent struggles between the superintendents and the presbyterian party. How then can it be supposed that episcopacy (if an usurpation) should have prevailed in all the churches of the world, without the least notice or opposition by any whatever? No man can tell the beginning of episcopacy, short of the apostles, any more than the beginning of monarchy, short of Adam, who was the first king,—or the division of the nations after the flood; but every man can tell when presbytery began. There was not a presbyterian church in the whole world before the days of John Calvin, who pleaded necessity; nor in Scotland before Andrew Melville, who was governed by a spirit of pride and ambition. Therefore episcopacy must be the original apostolical government of the church; for that government, whose beginning we know not, must have been from the beginning[1].

The sacred office of the ministry is essential to the christian church; and as Christ instituted and ordained the apostles, and sent them on their mission with a promise that He would be with them to the end of the world, we must not institute a new order of ministers, and no man can give them a

[1] Leslie's Theological Works.

divine mission. It must be evident to every person exercising any consideration, that His promise must apply to a *succession* of ministers from the apostles, who should hold the same supereminent rank which they did; for the promise of perpetuity could not be made to them alone, for they all died violent deaths within a very few years, and the end of the world is not come yet; so that it must have been to their successors in office also that He promised his perpetual presence and help. We are informed in the history of every christian country, of the succession of the bishops from the hands of the apostles down to the present day; and the episcopacy appears to have been as universally received as the sacraments of the church or the inspired word of God.

There are certain marks by which the true church can at all times and in all places be distinctly recognised:—1. *The Word of God*; 2. *The means of Grace*; 3. *A regularly authorised ministry*. The word of God, as always understood and interpreted by the faithful, must be the only rule of faith and doctrine[1]. The appointed means of grace must be duly and regularly administered; and the ministers themselves must have a commission from Christ to empower them to act in his name. "Where these three marks are clear and distinct, there the church of God is to be found. Where any of them is changed or counterfeited, there the church is in error. Where any of these is wanting, there the church is not[2]." The *first mark* is necessary, because it is impossible to please and serve God aright without a full knowledge of His will, nor to make this life a preparation for the next. The *second mark* is necessary, because by nature we are born in wrath and spiritually dead; and therefore it is necessary that we be born again in the one sacrament, and fed and nourished in spiritual life by the other. Spiritual life is begun in the soul of man by divine aid; and it is born, strengthened, and brought to maturity, by those means of grace which He has instituted, of which the two sacraments of baptism and Lord's Supper are the principal: the former for bringing the life in the soul to the birth, and the latter for nourishing and supporting it. *The third mark* is necessary, "Because Christ is not merely the only Redeemer of the human race, but also the only Mediator between God and man. Hence, correctly speaking, he is the only *Prophet* that can instruct us in the divine will; the only *Priest* that can make atonement for us and dispense to us the riches of

[1] Acts, ii. 41, 42.
[2] Pratt's Old Paths, where is the Good Way, p. 4-5.

God's grace; and the only king that can give laws to the kingdom of peace or church of God. "Without me," says our Saviour, "ye can do nothing." Therefore none but the Messiah, or one whom he has authorised to act in his stead, can as a prophet or teacher authoritatively proclaim "peace and good will towards men;" nor as a priest receive a child of Adam from the outer state in which it is naturally born, into the church of God, and there administer to it, as the adopted child of God, the bread of life and cup of salvation; nor as a king give laws to the kingdom of righteousness, and take care that all things be done decently and in order. In short, without a regularly authorised ministry, there can be no church[1].

At the period of which we are now treating, the church of Scotland being under the dominion of the see of Rome, partook of all its errors and crimes. In consequence she had lost the *first mark* by the prohibition of the Scripture; and also the *second mark*, by adding to the means of grace of God's own appointment five rites which she calls sacraments, and by taking away the cup in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, although it be of Christ's own appointment. She had, however, in a great measure preserved the *third mark*, but not so completely but that even in it there were some flaws.

On the other hand, the system which supplanted the Roman church restored the *first mark* by importing a translation of the Scriptures from England, and earnestly inculcating its study upon all classes; and in all the subsequent changes which it has undergone it has ever held the Bible as its standard. The *third mark* was entirely disregarded, and has ever since continued to be considered of so little importance, that the apostolical rite of the imposition of hands was laid aside, as a ceremony which Knox and his coadjutors considered perfectly unnecessary. They *separated* from the Roman church and *destroyed* it, and did not, as in England, *reform* and *continue* it; but established an entire *new* churchdom, without any divine commission so to do. This is much to be lamented, as those who were in priests' orders had no authority to ordain others, far less to beget fathers in Christ[2], which Knox unhappily took upon himself to do. That Knox himself was in priests' orders is a fact which his biographer, the late Dr. M'Crie, has placed beyond dispute, and some of the other leaders were also priests; but the greater number of the

[1] Old Paths, &c. pp. 11, 12.

[2] 1 Cor. iv. 15.

preachers, and all those who subsequently became ministers, were totally without any orders whatever, not even such as the superintendents could have given them; for their own supposed call, the election of the people, and the *civil* ceremony of *induction* to the living, was all that was then "judged necessary." As the *third mark* of a duly authorised ministry to act as ambassadors of Christ was wanting, it followed as a matter of course that the ministers of the Scottish reformation were entirely deficient of the *second mark*, or the means of grace, because no man can administer the sacraments but one who is duly authorised to represent Christ, the great High Priest of the Church and bishop of souls; and as these men were not duly called, as was Aaron, therefore they could not enter into covenant with God, nor sign and seal in His name. The Scottish reformers therefore greatly erred when they assumed the christian ministry without a lawful call and ordination from men having authority in the kingdom of Christ, handed down, as Calvin rightly says, "from hand to hand, from the Apostles," who themselves received authority from Christ, as he did from the Father on the day of his baptism by John in Jordan. The mark of the apostolical succession has been handed down from Christ in as visible a manner as either of the other two marks—the word of God or the means of grace. The *divine presence* was promised to be with the church till time shall merge into eternity; and it is to be found only in connection with the three marks of the church—*the word of God, the means of grace*, and the *Christian ministry*. It is painful to come to the conclusion, that notwithstanding their zeal for the glory of God and the reformation of his church, which they sincerely felt, yet it cannot be denied that they were altogether deficient of the second and third marks of the christian church[1].

The christian church succeeded to the Jewish; and the high priest, the priest and the Levite of the latter, gave place, in the fulness of time, to the bishop, the priest, and the deacon of the former. The author and finisher of our faith took away or abrogated the first will or law of God; that is, He took away the law and the legal priesthood and sacrifices, and established the second will—that is, the gospel and the evangelical priesthood, with the commemorative sacrifice of Christ, by the which will or evangelical priesthood and sacrifice we

[1] The Old Paths, where is the Good Way; by the Rev. J. B. Pratt. Parker, Oxford. The subject which is here only alluded to is there amply and conclusively reasoned, in a manner worthy of the most serious attention.

are sanctified through the offering of Christ's body once for all. It is evident from St. Paul's words, that "no man taketh this honour—of the priesthood—upon himself, but he that is called of God;" that it is a most honourable office, and can be derived from GOD only, who is the fountain of honour; and therefore our reformers having taken this most honourable office on themselves, without any authoritative call, were not really priests or ministers of God, but their claim was ideal and imaginary; and it is a melancholy truth that they ran unsent.

Although the Scoto-papal church possessed the third mark, a regular ministry, yet it was so debased by the mixture of lay commendators, who were called bishops, abbots, and priors, and who were a disgrace to the functions which they usurped, that unhappily our reformers, but especially their leader, were not afraid to despise their dominion, and to speak evil of the dignitaries who had legal and ecclesiastical possession of the bishopries and parochial benefices. They became presumptuous and self-willed, walking after the flesh, in the lust of uncleanness, and despised their government and office. The Scoto-papal bishops (always excepting the commendators) were really consecrated, and the inferior clergy were really called as was Aaron; but how was he called? In the old law God gave the priesthood to Aaron by name, and entailed the succession in his family, so that all his posterity were priests. When this priesthood was extinguished, together with the Jewish law, God glorified Christ and made Him the first high priest of the gospel, "a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec." And Christ still executes this office himself in heaven, at the right hand of God, and continually intercedes with God the Father for his Church and all its members. But before his ascension, he conferred the priesthood on his apostles after his resurrection: "as my Father hath sent me, so send I you," and whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain they are retained." These were therefore sent as priests, for they were sent as Christ himself had been sent by the Father, for the apostle says Christ was *a priest for ever*; and consequently they and their successors must be priests likewise, for He sent them as the Father had sent him. He promised to be with them even to the end of the world, which could not be, unless they were to have successors in their offices, and their priesthood was made perpetual, and, like his own, to continue for ever. The apostles conceived, that having been sent by Christ as He had been sent by the Father, that they had thereby received authority to send others also; and accord-

ingly they ordained elders, presbyters, or priests, in every church that they had planted. Some of those whom the apostles ordained they also commissioned to ordain others, as appears from what St. Paul said to Titus, whom he constituted chief bishop or superintendent of Crete. "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that *thou* shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and *ordain* elders or priests in every city." And also to Timothy, whom he appointed the superintendent or bishop of Ephesus, and whom he instructed to ordain or lay hands suddenly, or without due examination, on no man. All priests had not the fulness of apostolical power, but only the chief priests or bishops. There were many elders or priests at Ephesus before Timothy was sent to oversee them, yet the power of ordination was confined to him alone. By the bishops whom the apostles ordained to that office has the succession of the Christian priesthood been continued down to the present time, and full faith and assurance may be placed in Christ's promise, that it will ever flow on in a continual stream of succession, and that He will be with it to the end of the world.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SUPERINTENDENTS.

The Confession of Faith ratified.—The Protestants court Elizabeth.—Death of King Francis.—Embassy to France.—Instructions respecting the mass.—Papal party recommend the Queen to land at Aberdeen.—First General Assembly.—Prosecution of the Romish clergy.—Debate betwixt Knox and Bishop Leslie.—An Assembly.—"Complaint" to Parliament.—Act for demolishing abbeys and churches—The execution of this act.—Noted expression of Knox.—Reflections.—Queen Mary's arrival—Her proclamation.—A riot at the Chapel Royal.—Earl of Arran's protest.—Knox preaches against the mass.—Conference with the Queen.—The Queen makes a progress.—The thirds of the benefices appropriated.—Suits to Rome prohibited.—Church lands conveyed by the clergy to their friends.—Bishop of Brechin.—Returns ordered of the church's revenues.—Petition to the Queen to suppress the mass.—A General Assembly—the legality of its meeting questioned.—Queen declines to ratify the Book of Discipline.—Thirds of ecclesiastical revenues.—Knox gives vent to his indignation.—Inauguration of Erskine of Dun.—Assembly.—Trial of superintendents.—Immorality.—Burgh laws.—Riots.—General Assembly.—Superintendents.—Bishop of Galloway's petition.—Assembly's answer.—Superintendent Spottiswood.—Petition or remonstrance to the Queen—Knox sent.

1561.—In the late convention or parliament the pope's authority was completely abolished, and severe penalties were imposed on those who should thereafter hear or say mass. The mantle of persecution had thus fallen from the old hierarchy on the new. Those very men who had not many months before petitioned the late queen regent for simple liberty of conscience and permission to worship God, enacted that the sayers or hearers of mass, were, for the first fault, to suffer confiscation of all their goods, and a corporal punishment at the discretion of the judge; for the second, banishment; and for the third, *death!* thus, unhappily, displaying the same persecuting and vindictive spirit which had disgraced the Romish church.

The Confession of Faith and Book of Discipline were ratified by an act of secret council, "as good and conform to God's word in all points,"—"providing that the bishops, abbots, priors, prelates, and beneficed men, who have already adjoined themselves unto us, bruik the revenues of their benefices during their lifetime; they sustaining and upholding the ministry and ministers as herein is specified, for the preaching

of the word and ministring of the sacraments[1]." The rapacious nobility who had unlawfully appropriated the church's property, ridiculed the new hierarchy as "*a devout imagination*, wherewith John Knox did greatly offend." John Knox was ever keenly alive to recover the lost "patrimony of the kirk," which had been seized by the hand of violence, at a period when the royal authority was insufficient to control the power of the turbulent nobility, or to protect the church's property and rights.

From the fate of Sir James Sandiland's mission, the protestant party were apprehensive that the French court meditated farther violence to their liberties, and they feared that Elizabeth might withdraw her support from them, on account of the losses which her troops had sustained on the last expedition. After the dissolution of the late convention, the Earls of Glencairn and Morton were therefore sent to London to return thanks to Elizabeth for her powerful and seasonable assistance; and to solicit farther support in the event of French invasion. But the death of Francis dispelled their fears and elevated their hopes; and the protestant nobility despatched the lord James to France to persuade Queen Mary to return home to her kingdom, which was miserably divided by two great and equally bigoted parties, who mutually hated and abused each other. The council met on the 15th of January, and cautioned their representative respecting his sentiments on the Romish worship, which he would witness in all its splendour at the court of France. They peremptorily enforced upon him the necessity of assuring her majesty that the performance of the mass would not be tolerated in the kingdom either in public or in private. But the lord James was neither so illiberal nor so indelicate as his stern instructors, and replied: "I shall never consent that mass shall be performed *in public*; but if the queen wishes to have it celebrated in her own chamber, who could stop her?" This answer was not satisfactory to the ministers. Meantime, the popish party, which was both numerous and powerful, met secretly, and resolved to send MR. JOHN LESLIE, the official or archdeacon and vicar-general of Aberdeen, and afterwards a privy councillor, president of the Court of Session, and bishop of Ross, to offer their duty and fidelity to her majesty. They strongly recommended her majesty to return home, but to land at Aberdeen, where the papal interest was still powerful and the people were supremely loyal; and where she might again re-

[1] Knox.

establish the ancient hierarchy with the assistance of the Earl of Huntly and other faithful noblemen. Mr. Leslie was also instructed to represent to her majesty the dangerous character and ambitious designs of her brother, the lord James. He assured her that he secretly contemplated the usurpation of the crown, and he recommended his detention in France, at least till the affairs of the church were settled. But an interview the next day with her illegitimate brother removed all her suspicions of his treasonable views, and "Mr. Leslie acknowledges that the prior soon perceived the queen's heart to be inclined towards him."

The protestant hierarchy, under the supremacy of John Knox and his vigorous direction, held their FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY on the 20th of December, and continued their sittings till the beginning of the present year. There were only six ministers present; the remaining thirty-four members were laymen, and they sat for seven sessions without a president or moderator, after which Superintendent Willock was placed in the chair. This assembly prosecuted the war vigorously against the sacred buildings; and the church of Restalrig, which was the seat of a deanery, was ordered to "be rased and utterly destroyed, being a monument of idolatry." They also petitioned the privy council to appoint none to public offices but the professors of the reformed religion; and to inflict sharp punishments upon all idolaters and the maintainers of idolatry in saying of mass. In consequence, a continued course of prosecutions was instituted against the papal clergy and their followers, for the celebration of the rites of the Romish church. Four persons were summoned from the University of Aberdeen, among whom was Mr. Leslie, to sustain a controversy with Knox and others before the privy council. Each party claimed the victory. Mr. Leslie says, the papal champions argued so learnedly on the nature and efficacy of the sacrament of the eucharist, that their friends were greatly strengthened and edified, and their opponents confounded. Knox, on the other hand, asserts that Leslie was an ignorant dunce; and Leslie said of Knox, that "he had an unbridled licentiousness in speaking, mixed with a virulent fluency of words[1]."

Another assembly met in Edinburgh on the 26th May, and vehemently importuned a convention of the estates which was then sitting "for the suppression of idolatry throughout the whole realm, and punishing the users thereof." One of the "items" of their "complaint" respects the diocesan authority

[1] Keith, b. iii. cap. i. p. 500.

of the superintendents, that "maintenance and special provision be made for superintendents, for the erecting and establishing *of more* in places convenient, and for punishing of the contemners of the said superintendents, and disobeyers of them." A petition was presented to the convention replete with the most uncharitable abuse of their opponents, and the most unjust reflections upon their loyalty to the crown. They crave the most severe and unrelenting vengeance on the papal clergy, whom they call "the pestilent generation of the Roman antichrist"—"tyrants and dumdogs;" and "that such order may be taken, that *we* have not occasion to *take again the sword* of just defence into our hands." This, says Bishop Keith, is "a fair acknowledgment that *the new form was introduced by the sword*." These men, into whose hands the ministers said they had resigned the sword, were not backward in complying with their desires, and an act was forthwith passed for demolishing the cloisters and abbey churches, such at least as still remained entire from the fury of the "rascal multitude." To the Earls of Arran, Argyle, and Glencairn, were committed the barbarous demolition of those in the west country; those in the north to the lord James; and those in the midland counties "to some barons that were held most zealous." "Thereupon," says Spottiswood, "ensued a pitiful vastation of churches and church buildings throughout all parts of the realm; for every one made bold to put to their hands, the meaner sort imitating the ensample of the greater and those who were in authority. They rifled all the churches indifferently, making spoil of every thing they found. The vessels appointed for the service of the church, and whatsoever else made for decoration of the same, were taken away and applied to profane uses. The buildings of the church defaced; timber, lead, bells, put to sale and alienated to merchants. The very sepulchres of the dead were not spared, but digged, ript up, and sacrilegiously violated. Bibliotheques destroyed, the volumes of the fathers, councils, and other books of human learning, with the registers of the church, cast into the streets, afterwards gathered into heaps and consumed with fire. In short, all was ruined, and what had escaped in the time of the first tumult did now undergo the common calamity; which was so much the worse that the violences committed at this time were shadowed with the warrant of public authority. Some ill-advised preachers did likewise animate the people in their barbarous proceedings, crying out, 'that the places where idols had been worshipped ought by the law of God to be destroyed, and that the sparing

of them was the reserving of things execrable,' mistaking, as if the commandment given to Israel for destroying the places where the Canaanite had worshipped their false gods, had been a warrant for them to do the like[1]." Knox is said on this occasion to have used the noted speech ascribed to him, "*that the sure way to banish the rooks was to pull down their nests;*" alluding to the cloisters, whose plunder animated the "rascal multitude" to demolish the abbeys; while the nobility seized on the lands belonging to these societies.

From the absence of the queen and the delegated authority of regents, the nobility had acquired an independence highly dangerous to the safety and just power and authority of the crown. The robbery and spoliation of the territorial possessions of the church had increased their wealth and means of resisting the government, and indeed of setting it at defiance, to which their own turbulent inclinations, and the weakness of the sovereign, occasioned by frequent and long minorities, but too fatally contributed. From the death of Mary of Lorraine, the kingdom had been without a regular government, and in a state little short of anarchy, while Elizabeth had gained a complete ascendancy in the councils of the kingdom, and contributed to keep alive and foment the civil and religious dissensions, which the "rascal" mode of reforming religion, and the plunder and devastation of the churches and church property, had occasioned among the Scots. Add to these evils, the new democratic doctrines that had been introduced, and the inculcating of the systems of ancient Greece and Rome, and all their antiscriptural maxims of government, had introduced a republican spirit, which unhappily prevails but too generally there at this day. The Scots had hitherto been always favourable to monarchy, which is the only government of divine appointment, and the Scottish history shows fewer instances of breaches of the regal succession than that of any other nation. Loyalty and attachment to the sovereign were national virtues till the Genevan doctrines were introduced, which taught them resistance to lawful governors as a principle of the new religion. The Grecian were the first republics that ever existed in the world. To escape from what they called the *tyranny* of that hereditary monarchy under which God had placed them, they put themselves under the insupportable tyranny of thirty tyrants; and tried every scheme of government, after they had forsaken the right one. Every little town erected itself into an independent re-

[1] Spottiswood's MS. cited by Keith, b. iii. c. i. pp. 502-4.

public, and they were perpetually engaged in war with each other, manuring their common country with Grecian blood; so that since Adam, who was the first king, so lamentable a scene of blood, slaughter, and confusion, never was seen under *any* monarchy, as these Grecian republics exhibited. Their democratical governments always showed the greatest ingratitude to their generals and deliverers; ostracism or death being the lot of every one who had rendered eminent services to his country. This was not owing to any greater propensity to injustice or ingratitude in the Greeks than existed in any other nation; but in the popular form of their government. Mercy and compassion must ever be incompatible with republican governments, because the odium of a guilty deed is divided among many, and every individual member shifts it off his own conscience, thinking that he is the less guilty because others are concerned. Bodies of men never pardon, and are incapable of mercy, and their sentence once passed cannot be reversed; such governments, therefore, of all judgment and no mercy, cannot emanate from God. Greece has long suffered the just judgments of God for setting the example to other nations of the breach of his monarchical institution, and which was held up as the model for the Scots to follow, rejecting the plain commands of Scripture, and the long line of illustrious monarchs who had swayed the Scottish sceptre. To this republican spirit which Knox introduced, and which was also sedulously taught by Buchanan, must be attributed the ungovernable temper which distracted the whole of Mary's reign, and those of her hereditary successors, and produced that rebellion against her person and government which drove her to the fatal measure of throwing herself into the power of Elizabeth. But in England, on the contrary, where no such republican principles had been as yet entertained, where there was a powerful and vigorous government, and the prerogative of the crown was strained even to tyranny, the utmost tranquillity and prosperity were the natural fruits of obedient subordination; and the firm sceptre of Elizabeth is yet looked back to as the most glorious of all her illustrious predecessors.

On the 20th of August, Mary Stuart, dowager of France, arrived in her native kingdom, and landed at Leith, amidst the joyful acclamations of her subjects. Elizabeth refused her a safe conduct through or even along the coast of England; and as the lord James, with the crafty Lethington, had been recently at the court of England, this insult is ascribed, not improbably, to their advice. It is also insinuated that the lord James advised the treacherous and most ungenerous con-

duct pursued by Elizabeth, of fitting out a fleet to seize her person; but which she providentially escaped. But this charge against the lord James rests chiefly upon the uncharitable suspicions of his enemies, grounded, however, on the duplicity and bad faith of Elizabeth. The first act of Mary's government was one of grace. She issued a proclamation of her own free will, wherein she assured her people, "that no change or alteration should be made in the present state of religion, only she would use her own service apart with her family, and have mass in private[1]." The more rational men thought this not unreasonable; but the fierce bigots of the party stormed mightily, and protested that they would suffer neither private nor public mass; and in consequence, when the queen's confessor was preparing to celebrate that rite in the chapel-royal, he was attacked by a riotous mob, who demolished the furniture of the chapel, and were with difficulty restrained from doing instant execution on the officiating priest, against whom it was strongly urged to enforce the penalty of death, awarded, by act of parliament, to the sayers and hearers of mass.

At the instigation of some unreasonable adviser, the Earl of Arran declared, in the hearing of the herald who read the queen's proclamation, that he would not consent to extend any protection to the queen's court or domestics; and he afterwards presented a formal protest to the queen herself, in which he threatened that "idolaters should die the death," &c. This, with the preceding riot and obstruction to the private enjoyment of her religion, exasperated the queen; and her indignation was still farther increased by the violence of Knox, who on Sunday, the last day of August, inveighed with his usual bitter animosity against idolatry, and said, "that one mass was more frightful to him than if a thousand armed enemies were landed in any part of the kingdom to suppress the whole religion." This sermon created a mighty sensation both in the city and in the court. The queen, therefore, sent for Knox, and accused him of having raised a part of her subjects against her mother and herself, and of having been the cause of great sedition and slaughter in England. Knox not only defended himself, but attacked the queen's principles, "the vanity of the papistical religion, and the deceit, pride, and tyranny of that Roman antichrist." He severely inveighed against the proclamation for liberty of conscience, which she had issued, as being hypocritical and evil designed. But Bishop Leslie, who was better

[1] Keith, b. iii. c. ii. 505.—Knox, b. iv. 263-4.

able to judge of the prospects of his own church than Knox, dates the *entire ruin of the papal religion* in Scotland from her proclamation on the 25th of August; because it had given the Knoxian party the royal sanction to the reformed religion, of which it was before entirely destitute[1]. Of course Knox claims a triumph over the queen's theology; but we have no other authority than his own version of the conversation, which must be taken with *reserve*. He says, "he found in her *a proud mind, a crafty wit, and an obdurate heart against God and his truth;*" that is, against his opinions: from which it may be gathered that his victory had not been so easy as he makes it appear in his book.

The queen made a progress to her chief towns during the autumn, and had mass celebrated wherever she went, and particularly on her return to Holyrood House, on All Saints' Day, the first of November. Knox and some other ministers made violent complaints to such of the nobility as were then at court; but the warmth of the palace fire had made them less zealous, and they began to *doubt* "whether subjects might put hand to suppress the idolatry of their prince." This created a violent dispute between the lords and Knox, and, as they could not agree, the latter proposed to refer it to their brethren at Geneva; "yet," says Heylin, "they shewed plainly, by insisting on that proposition, both from whose mouth they had received the doctrine of making sovereign princes subject to the lusts of the people, and from whose hands they did expect the defence thereof[2]."

The ordinary revenue not being sufficient for the expenditure of the crown, the church property was sacrificed to make up the deficiency, and the third part of all the revenues of the clergy, both prelates and beneficed priests, was devoted to this purpose; which the Roman Catholic clergy the more readily agreed to yield up, in order that they might be secured of the residue. "It carried some show of commodity," says Spottiswood, "at first, but turned eventually to very little account, for the clergy undervalued their property, and the produce left the protestant ministry scarcely any thing, for this third was to be divided betwixt the court and the new hierarchy."

On the 10th of September there was published an Act of Privy Council, which had then the force of law during the intervals of parliament, discharging all suits in the court of

[1] Keith, b. iii. c. 2, p. 506.—Knox, b. iv. p. 265-8.

[2] Heylin's History of Presbyterians, b. iv. p. 146.—Keith's History, b. iii c. 2, p. 506.

Rome for church lands. When the papal clergy saw that there was no prospect that their church would ever recover its former ascendancy, and that in a short time they would be ejected from their benefices, they began to convey the lands to their friends, as the act says, "in feu-farm and heritage;" and those to whom the lands were conveyed sent to Rome and obtained confirmations of the said lands. This act, therefore, stopped the confirmations from Rome, under the pain of barratry or simony, the punishment of which was banishment and infamy: but the alienations were, nevertheless, allowed to proceed. "The popish churchmen," says Archbishop Spottiswood, "who were in *a foolish pity*, suffered to enjoy their livings (partly out of malice to religion [he means the reformation], and partly of a fear they conceived to be spoiled of their benefices), made away with all their rents, manses, glebes, tithes, and whatsoever else belonged to the church, unto some great ones that were their friends and kinsmen, who found the means, by making corrupt laws, to strengthen their titles, and so from time to time have, under colour of right, defrauded the church of her due patrimony." It was the queen's "*foolish pity*" which consummated this wicked sacrilege, by giving her consent in parliament; but even then she acted under the treacherous advice of councillors who had a present or remote interest in the spoliation of the church. The rents of the church were alienated by the *titular* bishops and abbots, who got possession after the change in religion. A more flagrant instance of this presentation of laymen to bishopries, and of the interested objects of the nobility in counselling the queen to bestow the patronage of the crown, cannot be shewn than in the appointment of Alexander Campbell to the bishopric of Brechin. This *boy* was the son of Campbell of Ardkinglas, of the family of Argyle, and in the year 1566 he received a royal license to go to Geneva to finish his education, where he remained at school till 1574. This grant of the bishopric contained a new and unheard-of power *to dispose and alienate the benefices as well of the spirituality as of the temporality of the bishopric!* viz. "with power to him to give and dispose of each benefice, as well of spiritual as of temporal dignity, or other things within the diocese of Brechin now vacant, or when it shall happen that the same shall become vacant, which were formerly in the gift or patronage of the bishops of Brechin." This *boy-bishop* never was consecrated, nor ever exercised any other part of the episcopal functions, than to comply with the above clause in his grant to alienate a great part of the lands and tithes of the bishopric to the chief of his family, the Earl of Argyle: "and truely," says

Keith, "he made sufficient use afterwards of this power; for he alienated most part of the lands and tithes of the bishopric to his chief and patron the Earl of Argyle, retaining for his successors scarce so much as would be a moderate competency for a minister in Brechin." The Earl of Argyle had also secured the greater part of the lands belonging to the bishopric of the Isles.

On the 22d of December, the privy council issued an order requiring a return to be made of the revenues of all the bishopries, abbeys, monasteries, priories, and religious houses of every description in the kingdom; those on the south of the Grampians were to be given in before the 24th of January; and those on the north of that immense ridge of mountains, before the 10th of February, 1662. For obvious reasons the revenues were greatly underrated by the parties interested, and the returns were made as low as possible. The Archbishop of St. Andrews, the Bishops of Moray, Dunkeld, and Ross, voluntarily offered to resign one-third part of their revenues for the use of the queen, out of which she was to pay a small allowance to the protestant preachers[1]. The lord James,

[1] The revenues of the church were immense: they have been recently enumerated with great industry by Mr. Lawson, from whose useful work we shall extract the returns of the diocese of St. Andrews. The Archbishop of St. Andrews "ranked next to the royal family, and with whom was the exclusive right of crowning the Scottish monarchs. The power of the Archbishop of St. Andrews was as extensive in matters temporal as it was in ecclesiastical affairs. In virtue of his office he was, like the bishops of Durham, count palatine and lord of regality, the latter jurisdiction being equivalent to that exercised in modern times by a sheriff or steward, while the lands within the bounds of the regality belonged to the lord of the regality, either in property or superiority. Three of those regalities belonged to the archbishopric: Monymusk, in Aberdeenshire; Kirkliston, in Linlithgowshire; and St. Andrews, in Fife. The lordship of Monymusk, according to Buchanan, was conferred on the see in 1057, in consequence of a vow made by Malcolm IV., grandson of David I., to St. Andrew, titular saint of Scotland. At the revolution of 1688, when the present presbyterian church supplanted the episcopal establishment, the Marquis of Huntly was chief vassal, paying the annual sum of £300 Scots of feu-duties to the see. The lordship of Kirkliston, sometimes called the regality of St. Andrews south of the Forth, was very ancient, but it is not known by whom it was erected. It was of considerable extent, comprehending the greatest part of the counties of Stirling, Linlithgow, Edinburgh, and Haddington. The earls of Winton, attainted in 1715, were heritable bailies of this regality, until they sold their right in 1677 to the ancestor of the present earls of Hopetoun. The lordship of St. Andrews, erected prior to the year 1309, but by whom is uncertain, was the most comprehensive of the three, extending to all the lands held of the archbishop, of the prior and convent, and of the provostry of Kirkheugh in the counties of Fife, Perth, Forfar, and Kincardine, as well as in the counties south of the Forth not included in the other regalities. The Learmonths of Dairsie in Fife were the heritable bailies of the archbishop in this important regality till 1663, when the office was conferred upon the earls of Crawford. Since the Revolution of 1688, the crown has exercised all the privileges of these regalities, and others of a similar nature in the

who had been created earl of Mar, with the other leading protestant noblemen, were appointed to modify the stipends; and

other Scottish dioceses. By a tax-roll of 1665, it appears that one marquis, fifteen earls, three viscounts, and five barons, besides many persons of inferior rank, held lands of the archbishop. It was said by Dr. John Spottiswood, son of the archbishop and historian, that the Archbishop of St. Andrews could leave England, travel far into Scotland, and lodge every night on his own lands, or on lands held of him.

"The Archbishops of St. Andrews could judge in many civil cases which are now competent to the Court of Session. They were supreme judges in matters criminal within their own regalities: they were admirals in all places within their bounds, which comprehended the whole sea-coast between the Forth and the Tay: and they had also the privilege of coining money confirmed to Archbishop Shevez by James III. in 1480, and hence called the *golden charter*. They were *conservators of the privileges of the Church of Scotland*, perpetual moderators or chairmen of national or provincial synods, constant chancellors of the University of St. Andrews, and sat in parliament as temporal lords in all the following capacities:—Lord Archbishop of St. Andrews, primate of the kingdom, first of both estates spiritual and temporal, lord of the lordship and priory of St. Andrews, lord Keig and Monymusk, lord Byrehills and Pouhtf, lord Kirkliston, lord Bishopshire, lord Muckhartshire, lord Scotscraig, lord Stow, lord Monymail, lord Dairsie, lord Angus, lord Tyningham, and lord Little Preston.

"In the '*Reliquiæ Divi Andreæ*' by Martine, we have a list of all the 'benefices and prelacies,' as he calls them, belonging to the see, in which the incumbents were confirmed by the archbishops of St. Andrews, taken from a tax-roll of the archbishopric in 1547. Under the archdeaconry of St. Andrews he enumerates twenty-six benefices; under the deaconry of St. Andrews, twenty-one; under that of Fothric, four; Gowrie, six; Angus or Forfar, fifteen; Mearns, seven; Linlithgow, twenty-one; Haddington, eight; Dunbar, fifteen; the Merse, or Berwickshire, eight; in all 131 benefices, none of which was under £40 of annual valued rent, besides a number of churches and chapels in various parts of the kingdom. . . . . Proceeding, therefore, to the record preserved among the Harleian MSS. in the British Museum, we find the following statement of the rental of the archbishopric as returned by Archbishop Hamilton in 1561-2, exclusive of the priory and other religious establishments in the diocese:—

ARCHBISHOPRIC OF ST. ANDREWS.

Annual rental in money	£2904	17	2
Wheat, 30 chalders, 8 bolls, 3 firlots, 1 peck.			
Barley, 41 chald. 10 bolls, 2 firlots, 1 peck.			
Oats, 67 chald. 13 bolls, 3 firlots.			
Meal, 12 bolls.; Pease, 4 tibs.			
[In the Books of the Assumption, there is a deduction allowed to the archbishop for necessary payments, so that the money is reduced to £2160. 17s.			
Wheat to 21 chald. 8 bolls, 1 firlot, 3½ pecks.			
Barley to 29 chald. 10 bolls, 2 pecks.			
Oats to 51, chald. 5 bolls, 1 firlot, 3½ pecks.]			
Archdeaconry of St. Andrews	600	0	0
Archdeaconry of Tiviotdale	226	6	8
Archdeaconry of Lothian, consisting of the parsonages of Currie, Restalrig, and Crookstone	720	13	4
	£4451	17	2

For the other dioceses, which were equally liberally endowed with money and grain, we refer to Mr. Lawson's Roman Catholic Church in Scotland, a very interesting work.

Wishart, laird of Pitarrow, the brother of him who had been burnt in the year 1546, was appointed pay-master. "All these persons were known to be first-rate men among the godly, earnest subverters of the ancient establishment, and keen promoters of the new discipline. And 'who,' says Knox, 'would have thought that when Joseph ruled in Egypt his brethren should have travelled for victuals—so busy and circumspect were the modificators that the ministers should not be over-wanton, that three hundred marks was the *highest* that was appointed to any.'" The bishop asserts the books of Assignation show that Knox has not here understated the sum, but that the highest was really as he states it[1].

The queen called a convention of estates, but no churchmen were admitted. It was ordained in it, that touching religion nothing should be meddled with, but that all things should remain in the same state they were in on the day that the queen landed at Leith. There was likewise an act passed nominating a council, consisting of twelve of the nobility, among whom was included the lord James, who is designated the Prior of St. Andrews[2].

1562.—Certain commissioners of the church petitioned the queen to abolish the mass and other superstitious rites of the Romish Church, and to inflict punishment against blasphemy and contempt of the word; and that popish churchmen should be excluded from places in session and council. To which the queen indignantly replied, "that she would do nothing in prejudice of the religion she professed; and hoped, before a year was expired, to have the mass and Catholic profession restored throughout the whole kingdom[3]." But by the insidious policy of the lord James, whom she had created earl of Moray, she completely prostrated the church which she was so anxious to uphold. Balfour says, "George Earl of Huntly, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, is killed this year, and his second son beheaded, and his eldest son sentenced likewise to lose his head; but by the queen's clemency the rigour of that sentence was moderated to perpetual prison in Dunbar Castle: at this same time also the Earl of Sutherland was banished the realm, and John Hamilton, Archbishop of St. Andrews, imprisoned; and all this was done (as the queen herself set down under her own hand) by the power of her brother James, earl of Moray, with the queen, to weaken the popish faction: ere she knew either his designs or what herself was doing, *she*

[1] Keith, b. iii. c. 2, p. 508. [2] Balfour's Annals, i. 326-7. [3] Spottiswood.

undid her best friends, and those that stood most for the pope's authority and Romish religion in Scotland[1]."

The third assembly convened about the end of December; but continued its sittings into this year. The warmth of the palace fire had slackened the zeal of some of the "earnest professors" among the nobility; and it was mooted whether or not the new ecclesiastical establishment might convocate assemblies without the queen's license, and enact ecclesiastical laws, which trenched in many cases upon the civil rights of her majesty's subjects. This unexpected check rather discomposed Knox's temper; but he was obliged to submit. The Book of Discipline was thereupon presented to her majesty for her approbation and ratification; but she declined to ratify it. Till that period the ministers had lived upon the scanty benevolence and voluntary offerings of their followers; the tithes and rents having been still paid to the papal incumbents. The revenue of the crown was dilapidated entirely during the queen's minority, and was not even sufficient for the domestic expenses of the court. The Lords of the Council therefore ordered that the third part of all the rents of the ecclesiastical benefices should be appropriated to the use of the queen; the other two-thirds to remain with the papal incumbents; and that the queen's third should be divided betwixt her majesty and the Knoxian ministers. The ministers were indignant at this regulation; for they challenged the whole revenue of the church as having devolved without diminution on them, and Knox gave utterance to his indignation in his usual powerful and vituperative language. He affirmed from the pulpit "That the Spirit of God was not the author of that order, by which two parts of the church rents were given to the devil, and the other third part was to be divided between God and the devil. Oh, *happy* servants of the devil (meaning the papal clergy), and *miserable* servants of Jesus Christ (his own brethren to wit), if, after this life, there were not hell and heaven![2]" In short, he made no scruple in asserting that the devil, or the papal clergy, would eventually get three parts of the third. In this short speech one cannot help observing the uncharitable sentiments of this remarkable man, although allowance must be made for the rude manners of the age, and the bitter disappointment which followed the evil and most disastrous course which he had pursued with the view of working out a good end.

[1] Balfour's Annals, i. 228.

[2] Knox's Hist.—Keith's Hist.—Heylin's Hist.—M'Crie's Life of Knox.

Knox was the superintendent of all the superintendents, a title somewhat similar to that of the "man of sin," against whom he was constantly pouring out the vials of his wrath, namely, the *servus servorum* of all saints. He accordingly went early in this year to Montrose to preside at the election and admission, which means the ordination, of John Erskine esquire, of Dun, near that town, as superintendent of Angus and Mearns[1]. The same questions were here propounded, and answers given, as at the inauguration of Spottiswood; but, as then, there was no laying on of hands. Notwithstanding the peculiar form which the Scottish reformation took of destroying all the land-marks and all the sacred edifices of the church which had been dedicated to the service of God, yet, so far from there being any reformation of morals, there seems to have been if possible a greater laxity than ever. For it is stated that in another assembly which met at Edinburgh on Christmas-Day, Superintendent Winram, of the district of Fife, was especially accused of slackness in his visitations; neglecting the affairs of kirks; of being much given to worldly business; negligent of preaching; rash in excommunicating; and sharp in exacting tithes. Even the respectable superintendent of Angus and Mearns, who had been so recently *admitted* by the infallible head of all the superintendents, himself was vehemently accused of *admitting* popish *priests* of vicious lives to the new order of *readers* or deacons "*in his diocese*;" of rashly admitting others as readers without trial and examination; of choosing men of vicious lives as elders or ministers; of permitting the non-residence of ministers, who neglect the sick, come too late on Sundays, and depart "incontinent after the sermon;" and of their neglecting to catechise the youth, and to meet together at the conferences[2]. The consequence was, that the people being thrown loose from all moral instruction and restraint, fell into the utmost depravity of manners, and it is acknowledged, "that suddenly *the most part of us declined* from the purity of God's word, and began to follow the world, and so again to shake hands with the devil and with idolatry." This is a fair acknowledgment that the religious distractions of the times, and the inefficiency of the new ministers, had driven many, who had clean escaped from the pollutions of popery, back into its pale in search of that peace which the new church was unable to bestow.

All the sins of the flesh—fornication, adultery, and incest—flourished to such an extent amongst the godly and earnest

[1] M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 133. [2] Calderwood's True Hist. p 32.

professors, that it became necessary to make a borough law for carting the guilty parties through the towns, in order to put them to shame; and the carting of an infamous fellow of the name of Sanderson created a dangerous riot in Edinburgh this year[1]. Another riot also occurred in consequence of the queen's uncle, the Marquis d'Elbeuf, and the lord John, prior of Coldingham, one of her majesty's illegitimate brothers, breaking open Cuthbert Ramsay's house in order to carry off Alison Craik, his daughter in law, who was gratuitously "suspected" to have been the Earl of Arran's concubine. This gave the preachers and the earnest professors a favourable opportunity of insulting the queen by a petition for summary vengeance on her uncle. She returned for answer, "that her uncle was a stranger, and had a young company; but she should take such order with him as should give them no cause to complain." But Knox remarks, "and so deluded she the just petitions of her subjects;" and then inserts in his book a most offensive and indecent tirade against the queen and her co-religionists. The queen's answer might have satisfied reasonable men, and Mr. Randolph, in one of his letters, remarks, "that the queen *reproved the doers in words sharp enough*;" but Knox forgot to pluck the beam out of his own eye before he made this "horrible villainy a fruit of the cardinal's good catholic religion," which "we shortly touch, to let the world understand what subjects may look for from *such* magistrates, for such to them is pastime[2]." We have just seen that such "horrible villainy" was as rife among the reformers as it had ever been in the papal church, for as they had removed the channels of grace which produce the fruits of the Spirit, so it is not marvellous that the fruits of the flesh and all its filthy lusts should abound.

In May, this year, the queen issued a proclamation against making any alteration in the form of the religion which she found established on her arrival, until the meeting of parliament, when "a final order by their (the three estates) advice and public consent might be taken in the said matter." She also created her illegitimate brother James, earl of Moray, and conferred on him all the property belonging to that earldom, part of which had been held in trust by the earls of Huntly, which laid the foundation of a long and deadly feud between these powerful noblemen.

The fourth General Assembly met in the dwelling-house of Henry Laws, on the 29th of June: "in the quhilk wer pre-

[1] Knox's Hist. b. iii. p. 252.
[2] Keith, b. iii. c. 2. pp. 508-10.—Knox, b. iv. p. 276-7.

sent the superintendents, ministers, and commissioners." Five superintendents or titular bishops are specified by name, and sixteen ministers, which appear to have been the whole strength of the protestant party, and they were all from the immediate neighbourhood of the metropolis. The principal business before it was the regulation of the due subordination of the ministers to their superintendents; and "it was ordained, that if ministers be disobedient to superintendents, that they must be subject to correction:" and again, "the slander raised upon Mr. Robert Hamilton, minister of Hamilton, was remitted to the trial of the superintendent of Glasgow to remove him out of the ministry, if he thought expedient." These are plain and undeniable marks of episcopal power which were lodged in that order of the ministers which Knox designated superintendents. In the second session, the true bishop of Galloway, who had turned protestant, petitioned to be permitted to retain his diocese, and to officiate in it as a *superintendent* of the new order which Knox had established. The Bishop of Galloway was not present as a constituent member, but he degraded his sacred office by petitioning to be allowed to denude himself of canonical orders, and to take part and lot with uncanonical laymen and schismatics from the Church Catholic, who had ventured to usurp offices to which they were never "called as was Aaron." While the Assembly were taking laudable measures to enforce obedience to the pseudo-episcopacy which had succeeded to the functions of the papal hierarchy, they rejected the fellowship of one who had canonical ordination, and had been lawfully put into possession of his bishopric. "It was answered by the Assembly to the petition of Mr. Alexander Gordon, anent the superintendentship of Galloway—1st. That they understand not how he hath any nomination or presentation, either by the lords of secret council or province of Galloway. 2dly. Albeit he hath presentation of the lords, yet he hath not observed the order kept in the election of superintendents, and therefore cannot acknowledge him for ane superintendent lawfully called *for the present;* but offered unto him their aid and assistance if the kirks in Galloway shall sute (petition), and the lords present: and requireth that before he depart, he subscribe the Book of Discipline. Further, it was concluded that letters should be sent to the kirks of Galloway, to learn whether they required any superintendent or not, and whom they required[1]." This Assembly gives another instance of the epis-

[1] 2d Sess. 1st July, from the Register cited in Keith, b. iii. c. ii. p. 512.

copal office of the superintendents, on the complaint of John Douglass of Punnerston, in the name of the parishioners of Calder; that in consequence of their minister having been promoted to the rank of a superintendent, they were "defrauded diverse times of the preaching of the word." To this it was answered, "the profit of *many kirks* was to be *preferred* to the profit of one particular, and that the kirk of Calder should either be occupied by *himself* (*i. e.* by Douglass, a layman!) or by some other qualified person in his absence," &c. Well and truly, indeed, might Archbishop Spottiswood call the Scottish reformation "irregular and disordered."

A petition to the queen was drawn up by Knox, and agreed to by the assembly, but which was conceived in such rude and offensive language, that Secretary Lethington refused to receive it. It was called a petition, but it was rather a peremptory demand, to which they would brook no denial, to put away—1st, "that idol and base service, the mass;" 2dly, for the "punishment of horrible vices, such as adultery, fornication, open whoredom, blasphemy, contempt of God, of his word and sacraments; which in this realm do even so abound that sin is reputed to be no sin." 3dly. For the relief of the poor and the poor ministers, who are so cruelly used by this last pretended order taken for sustentation, and "that those *idle bellies* (the papal clergy) who *by law can crave nothing* shall confess that they receive their sustentation and maintenance, *not of debt, but of benevolence*." 4thly. "That order be taken without delay to put the protestant ministers in possession of the glebes and glebe houses," although the former incumbents were guaranteed the possession during their lives. 5thly. That *all men be compelled to submit to the jurisdiction of the superintendents*, under a menace of taking the law by violence into their own hands. 6thly. That the lay-impropriators be compelled to sustain the ministers. 7thly. "We *desire* the churches to be repaired, and that sayers and hearers of mass be severely punished; and, 8thly, We most humbly *desire* of your majesty, &c. *a positive answer to every one of these heads before written*," &c.[1] Secretary Lethington recast the above remonstrance rather than petition, and then it was presented by superintendents Spottiswood and Winram, to whom her majesty replied, "Here are many *fair words;* I cannot tell what *the hearts* are[2]."

This assembly sent Knox into Ayrshire and Galloway, where he promoted a seditious association to maintain by

[1] Knox, b. iv. p. 282—4. [2] Keith, b. iii. c. ii. 515.

arms the protestant ministers, "against all *persons, power and authority* that will oppose itself to the doctrine proposed and by us received[1]." While in the west country, Knox held a disputation with Quinton Kennedy, Abbot of Crossraguel, and uncle of the earl of Cassilis; but it came to nothing, and both parties claimed the victory without deciding any point of faith or discipline. Knox's controversial powers consisted chiefly in rude, unmannerly, and railing speeches, and overbearing bluster; in which qualities he seems to have been an overmatch for every man of his age. The gentry of his own persuasion alleged, with too much appearance of truth, if we may judge by the spirit and language of his history, that all the preaching of the ministers was turned into railing; and the English resident took notice, in his letters to his court, "that Mr. Knox deborded too far in the pulpit from decency and sobriety."

1563.—The Roman Catholic clergy were now in their turn beginning to feel the rigours of persecution. The laws made in the parliament of 1560 were put in force against all who either said or heard mass. Archbishop Hamilton had been committed to Edinburgh Castle; Quinton Kennedy, abbot of Crossraguel, the prior of Whitehorn, with a number of priests and monks, were likewise committed close prisoners, for hearing and saying of mass[2]. These severities, together with the countenance which the queen showed to the reformed ministers, and her consent to acts of parliament in their favour, induced them to hope that she would renounce the Romish communion. Notwithstanding that she protected the persons of the superintendents and ministers, and by proclamation established their religion, and now exercised severities against the clergy of her own church, yet they ungratefully reviled her person, and insulted her crown with the most indecent and libellous language; even the grave has not yet covered the infamous lies, calumnies, and forgeries, which a political and religious faction invented and handed down to posterity, to blacken and defame the character of this most accomplished and unfortunate princess.

Calderwood informs us that "Master Knox went at this time to Dumfries, to the admission of a superintendent;" and found that the Bishop of Galloway "had corrupted the most part of the gentlemen;" but he does not tell us how he had corrupted them. He left Robert Pont there as his surrogate, and deferred the admission of bishop Gordon for the present; and there

[1] Knox, b. iv. 286.

[2] Bulfour's Annals, i. 328.

appears to be no one else that applied for that office from the honour-giving hands of Master Knox, who gave the whole of the superior order of the superintendents their orders, mission, jurisdiction, and succession. This fact alone shews the inconsistency and inversion of the whole Knoxian scheme, where an inferior minister ordained the superior order: and here is a duly and canonically consecrated bishop stooping to be re-ordained or admitted, as it was called by men who thus ran unsent, and to receive installation to his own diocese, from which he had never been legally ejected. Calderwood apologizes for the episcopal powers of the superintendents: "for as yet," says he, "presbyteries *were not constitute*, nor could be, for *scarcity of ministers*[1];" and I may here add that presbyteries were not so much as thought of, far less constituted, till the year 1579, full twenty years after the government of the kirk was settled by Knox.

"It has been an old observation," says Leslie[2], "that wherever presbytery was established, there *witchcraft* and *adultery* were particularly rampant. Witchcraft is a *spiritual adultery*, and the *carnal* commonly accompanies it; and rebellion is called witchcraft." The *carnal witchcraft* was a foul stain also that accompanied the other mark. From Dumfries, Master Knox went to Jedburgh, to investigate a scandal of adultery into which the lay-minister Methuen had again fallen, and who had been removed from Dundee with ignominy for the same abominable sin. He was found guilty, and condemned to do public penance on the "Cutty Stool" at the door of St. Giles's Cathedral, Edinburgh, for three successive Sundays. Methuen performed part of his sentence, but being overwhelmed with disgrace he fled to England: "*prudential reasons*," says M'Crie, "were not wanting to induce the reformed church of Scotland *to stifle this affair*, and to *screen* from public ignominy a man who had acted *a distinguished part* in the late reformation of religion[3]."

The fifth general assembly met in the end of the last year, and continued its sittings during the month of January. In this assembly the episcopal character of the superintendents was clearly shewn; complaints were made that the north country was entirely destitute of ministers, and that there was no superintendent for the diocese of Aberdeen. George Hay, John Row, and Adam Herriot, were proposed as candidates for that diocese, and the gentry were directed to elect one of

[1] Calderwood's True Hist. 32, 33. [2] Rehearsals, iii 63.
[3] M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 250, 251.

them forthwith; and Erskine, the superintendent of Angus and Mearns, was appointed to inaugurate the elected superintendent in the Cathedral of Old Aberdeen. John Hepburn, the minister of Brechin, was sent to the diocese of Moray, to search for men qualified for the ministry, and to send such to be ordained by the superintendent of Aberdeen, till one should be appointed to superintend the diocese of Moray. David Forrest and Patrick Cockburne were proposed to the district of Jedburgh, to be elected their superintendent, and the person chosen was to be inaugurated by the superintendent of Lothian and Mr. Knox. Bishop Gordon was at last appointed superintendent of Galloway, and to be inaugurated, that is, ordained, by the superintendent of Glasgow and Master Knox, and in the meantime the assembly licensed him "to admit ministers, exhorters, and readers, and to do such other things as were before accustomed in planting of kirks." The assembly also "empowered every superintendent within his own bounds or diocese . . . . . to translate ministers from one kirk to another as they shall consider necessary; and . . . . charged the ministers to obey the voice and commandment of their superintendents." It was ordained that "an uniform order should be kept in the ministration of the sacraments, solemnization of marriages, and burial of the dead, according to the book of Geneva. *Item*, that the communion be administered four times in the year within boroughs, and twice in the country parishes. The superintendents were appointed to confer with the privy council respecting the charge for the Communion elements; and it was concluded that no minister, &c. take upon them to cognosce (inquire into) or decide in cases of divorcement, *except the superintendent*[1]."

All presbyterian authors pertinaciously maintain that the order of superintendents was merely a temporary institution, and even assert that none other were ever appointed but the original five. From the registers of the assemblies, however, we have seen that several superintendents were added to the original number, and provision made for more; besides every precaution was taken to procure respect, consideration, and obedience to their government. This is an unexceptionable confirmation of the words of Erskine of Dun, one of these superintendents, who said, in a solemn report to the regent, "I understand *a bishop or superintendent to be but one office, and where the one is the other is.*" These transactions evince distinctly to how low an ebb the royal authority had fallen, when Knox,

[1] Keith, b. iii. c. iii. p. 516—19.

with his obsequious assemblies, disposed of all the higher kirk preferments without ever dreaming of consulting the crown; and he abrogated the old and enacted new laws touching the liberty and the consciences of the subject, with more despotism than if he had been the undoubted sovereign of the realm. A petition was presented to the queen for the establishment of judges in every province, to inquire into the cases of adultery, &c., which were of such frequent occurrence as to amount to a plague-spot upon the nation. Order was taken for compelling ministers to receive induction from the superintendents; and "because the rare number of ministers suffereth not any kirk to have a several minister," two or three neighbouring parishes were united, and the inhabitants of all were compelled to resort to one of them. It must be confessed that the Knoxian system had not improved either the morals or the manners of the people; and that stern professor had little right to cast the first stone at the papal clergy, for their immoralities, or for neglect of their sacerdotal duties. We have seen the whole kingdom, as it were, laid under an INTERDICT, from the want of ministers to officiate, and several parishes united under one; an evil that remains to this day, as these unions were never afterwards disunited: and hence the enormous extent of many of the parishes, which prevents many old people from attending the parish-church. It was also ordained, "that no work should be set forth in print, or published in writing, *touching religion or doctrine*, before it be presented to the superintendent of the diocese, revised and approved by him." If, says Bishop Keith, in a note, "this had any view to the prohibiting the publication of controversy in matters of religion, it would be construed to proceed from a consciousness of something we need not name[1]."

In August, a riotous mob attacked the palace, with the view of executing summary vengeance on the queen's domestic chaplain, who continued to say mass in the royal household. With the utmost difficulty the priest made his escape; but numbers of the citizens who attended his ministrations were seized and lodged in prison. The queen was much incensed at this wanton insult, which was entirely promoted by the protestant preachers. John Knox was summoned before the privy council, charged with having been the author of this sedition, and with having treasonably convocated the lieges by his missive letters. He appeared with a number of the ministers and

[1] Keith's Hist. b. iii. c. iii. p. 622-26.

others whom he had brought together, and answered, "that he was never a preacher of rebellion, nor loved to stir up tumults; contrariwise, he taught all people to obey their magistrates and princes under God. As for the convocation of the subjects, he had received from the church command to advertise his brethren, when he saw a necessity for their meeting—especially if he saw religion to be in peril." Then, rudely addressing the queen, "he charged her in the name of the Almighty God, and as she desired to escape his heavy wrath and indignation, to forsake that idolatrous religion which she professed, and, by her power, maintained against the statutes of the realm.[1]" Terrified by the menacing appearance of his supporters, the privy council acquitted him, and he says that they actually praised God for his *modesty* and sensible answers!

1564.—The seventh General Assembly met at the close of the last year, and chose Willock, the superintendent of the West, as the moderator. Hitherto there had not been any such functionary in any of their Assemblies. At which, the chief business was a long speech from Knox, in justification of what the law had declared high treason in seditiously summoning the ministers to meet and overawe the government. "The letter," says Keith, "was surely very seditious; and to grant Mr. Knox a liberty to write letters of such a strain was nothing less than *to keep a trumpeter of rebellion on daily wages*." The Assembly also settled a number of those complaints from the ministers against their superintendents, and of these, in turn, against the ministers for disobedience to their authority. Several old women were accused of witchcraft; and many young women of fornication with the ministers; an evil symptom of the Knoxian church, which occupied a very considerable portion of the time of every Assembly and Synod. Many complaints were also made of the poverty, and, in some cases, the utter destitution of the ministers, from the grinding rapacity of the lay impropriators. It would appear that the Book of Discipline of the new kirk had not met with universal nor cordial approbation; for its consideration and revisal was again pressed on the privy council, and it was referred to a committee, consisting entirely of laymen, for revisal[2].

Knox and his brethren held a communion in the month of April; but, hearing that a priest was celebrating mass in the chapel royal, they left their communion, and with some of the magistrates went and seized the priest, with all his assistants,

[1] Spottiswood.—Heylin, p. 155.

[2] Keith, b. iii. c. 3, p. 526-32.

and lodged them in gaol[1]. The same day they dressed the priest in his surplice, and set him up upon the market-cross, with the chalice fastened to his hand, where he was pelted with filth for the space of an hour. The next day he was publicly accused and convicted in course of law, which adjudged him to death; but, as the law had never been confirmed by royal authority, he escaped death, but was again pilloried for four hours, when the brutal rabble would have killed him had he not been rescued by the provost. The queen was much incensed at this wanton insult to herself and her religion, and she threatened the provost with heavy vengeance; but finding on inquiry by the lord advocate that he had done his duty, she excused him, and denounced the parties concerned to the next or eighth General Assembly, which met on the 25th of June. But, instead of giving her majesty any satisfaction, the Assembly drew up an article to be presented to parliament, in which it was desired, "that the papistical and blasphemous mass, with all the papistical idolatry and papal jurisdiction, be universally suppressed and abolished throughout this realm, not only in the subjects, but in the queen's own person." Great was the outcry, only a few years previous to this, by Knox and his brethren for liberty of conscience, and against the unmerciful tyranny of the papal prelates in not permitting them to have the free use of the new religion; but now, when in possession of power, they refused the slightest liberty of conscience even to their sovereign, who had shewn such wonderful liberality towards them[2].

Several foreign princes solicited Mary's hand in marriage; but the old Countess of Lennox, the lady Margaret, granddaughter of Henry VII., induced the queen to select her son, the lord Henry Steward, for her second husband. Henry Lord Darnley was descended of the blood-royal of England, and next after the queen of Scotland was the heir apparent of the throne of England. He was the son of the lady Margaret Douglas, the queen's own grandmother, the widow of James IV., and daughter of Henry VII., who, after James's death, married the Earl of Angus; consequently was next after Mary the nearest in proximity of blood to the English throne. By this marriage, she united her own title to that throne with the only man who could have disputed it with her.

[1] This was a reversal of our Saviour's injunction: "Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift."—*St. Matt.* v. 23-24.

[2] Keith's History.—Heylin's History, p. 155.—Knox, b. v. p. 325.

And like the union of the roses by their royal ancestor, these two illustrious individuals united the rose and the thistle, never, it is devoutly to be hoped, to be again separated. There was good policy in this marriage; for Darnley, being so nearly allied to the crown of England, might have married into some powerful family, and have disputed the succession, which would have been more plausible, as he was a native of England, whereas the queen of the Scots was an alien. Besides, he was of the same religion as herself, much about her own age, and very agreeable in his person. This match met with violent opposition from the ministers; and Knox denounced it with his usual scurrility from the pulpit. He desired his audience to note the day, "that whensoever the nobility of Scotland, who profess the Lord Jesus, should consent that an infidel (and all papists are infidels, he said,) should be head to their sovereign, they did, so far as in them laid, banish Christ Jesus from this realm; yea, and bring God's judgment upon the country, a plague upon themselves, and do small comfort to herself." Notwithstanding their opposition and the intrigues of Elizabeth, the queen married the lord Darnley in the chapel-royal, Holyrood House, in the month of July. The ceremony was performed by the Dean of Restalrig according to the ritual of the Roman church; and the next day Henry was proclaimed king by sound of trumpet, and associated with the queen in the government.

On the 15th of December the high court of parliament met chiefly for the purpose of reducing the Earl of Lennox's forfeiture; and an act was then passed in which the queen was declared to be of full age. Besides these, there was another act for the "confirmation of feus," which declared, "that the queen's confirmation of infeftments of feus, or seisin and delivery of property given by the prelates, was as valid as if the same had been obtained from the pope; and that no infeftments of kirk-lands not confirmed by her majesty should be of any avail." Another act provided, "that scandalous livers should be punished first by imprisonment, and then to be publicly shewn to the people with ignominy: to celebrate mass was made forfeiture of goods, lands, *and life*, except in the queen's chapel. But Knox complains that this severe enactment was never put in execution.

1565.—The ninth General Assembly met in the latter end of December of the last year, and elected Superintendent Erskine, of Dun, as their moderator. Early this year seditious letters were circulated, desiring the protestants to remember what the eternal God had wrought, &c., and admonishing the

brethren to strive and avert the evil which they ascribed to the queen's marriage. "By these letters," says Knox, "many brethren were *animated*, and their spirits *roused*, minding *to provide as God should give them grace*[1]." This means that they would appeal to arms, and which they did in the course of the summer; but rebellion may be ascribed to another spirit, who prompts to all the evil works of the flesh, rather than to the operation of divine grace, which is first *pure* and then *peaceable*; two qualities which we regret to think were decidedly wanting in the Knoxian system. The superintendent of Lothian petitioned the queen for the punishment of adultery, the practice of which increased daily, and also of idolatry, and for the entire suppression of the mass. The queen assured him that there should be "such provision made as should serve to their contentment." And her majesty wrote to the Archbishop of St. Andrews, and the Bishop of Aberdeen, "that they should not do any such thing as was feared by the protestants[2]."

The tenth General Assembly met in Edinburgh on the 25th of June, and Superintendent Willock was chosen moderator. From the complaints of ministers against their superintendents, and theirs against the ministers, with those of the people against both, there appears to have been the utmost confusion in every parish in the realm. The ministers removed from one kirk to another, as it suited their own private convenience or caprice, without any authority, and took possession without induction or presentation, leaving the deserted parish entirely without a minister. Of others it was complained, that the communion had not been administered in their parishes for six years! that is, since the violent silencing of the papal clergy, who, with all their faults, never neglected the administration of the sacraments. But, in fact, prayer and praise, and the sacraments, had been supplanted by the rage for preaching, which had been introduced by these men who ran unsent; for it is notorious that all those who were added to the Knoxian ministry since the original few who were priests, were altogether laymen. But the preachers were so scarce that vast numbers of the parishes were not supplied even with such lay preachers as they could appoint.

The Assembly drew up the following petition to the queen, which was presented at Perth, where the court then was;

[1] Knox's History, b. v. p. 324.
[2] Keith's History, b. iii. c. 4, p. 539.—Knox's History, b. v. p. 325.

but who deferred the answer to it till after her return to Edinburgh, where she could have the advice of her privy council:—

1. That the papistical and blasphemous mass, with all popish idolatry, with the pope's jurisdiction, should be universally suppressed and abolished through the whole realm,—not only amongst the subjects, but in her majesty's own person and family;—offenders to be punished according to law. That the true religion, formerly received, should be professed by the queen as well as by the subjects, and people of all sorts bound to resort on the Sundays, at least, to the prayers and preaching of God's word, as in former times they were holden to hear mass.

2. That sure provision be made for the sustentation of the ministry, as well for the time present as for the time to come, and their livings assigned them in the places where they serve, or at least in the places next adjacent; and that they should not be put to crave the same at the hands of any others. That the benefices now vacant, or that have fallen void since the month of March 1558, and such as should happen hereafter to be void, should be disponed to persons qualified for the ministry, on trial and admission (ordination) by the superintendents. That no bishopric, abbacy, priory, deanery, provostry, or other benefice, having more churches than one annexed thereto, should be disponed in time coming to any one man; but that the churches thereof be disponed to several persons, so as every man having charge may serve at his own church, according to his vocation. And to this effect, that the glebes and manses be given for the residence of ministers, and, likewise, that the churches be repaired; and an act be made in next parliament to that effect.

3. That none should be permitted to have charge of schools, colleges, and universities, or to instruct youth, either publicly or privately, till they were tried by the superintendents in their visitation of the churches, and after trial admitted to their charge.

4. That all lands founded of old to hospitality should be restored and applied to the sustentation of the poor; and that lands, annual rents, or other emoluments belonging sometime to the friars of whatsoever order, as likewise the annuities, alterages, obits, and the other duties pertaining to priests, be applied to the same use, and to the upholding of schools in the places where they lay.

5. That horrible crimes abounding in the realm, without any correction, to the great contempt of God and His Holy Word; such as idolatry, blaspheming of God's name, manifest violation of the Lord's Day, witchcraft, sorcery, and enchant-

ment; adultery, incest, open whoredom, maintaining of brothels, murder, slaughter, theft, rife and oppression, with many other detestable crimes, may be severely punished, and judges appointed in every province for executing the same, and that by act of parliament.

6. That some order should be devised and established for the relief of the poor labourers of the ground, who are oppressed in their tithes by leases set over their heads, and they thereby forced to take unreasonable conditions.

This petition shews the intolerance of the reforming ministers of the period, and exhibits a most lamentable list of crimes, which appear to have filled the country with violence and impurity. Although toleration for the opinions of others was then unknown, yet there was none of the infidel liberality [illegible] sent day, which confounds all distinctions. The queen, though belonging to a most intolerant church, showed the native goodness and charity of her heart in her answer, as well as the dignity befitting her high station, as head or civil governor of the church. She has been so reviled and hunted down as dissolute, cruel, and tyrannical, and the author of Knox's history has given such an uncharitable and unjust construction to all her actions, and whose misrepresentations have been so interwoven with the history of her reign, that unless a more candid account of that period had been left on record, her noble and dignified answer would not be credited.

The queen's answer was delivered in writing in the following terms:—First, when it was desired that the mass should be suppressed and abolished, as well in her majesty's own person and family as amongst the subjects, her highness did answer for herself, that she was in nowise persuaded that there was any impiety in the mass; and trusted her subjects would not press her to do against her conscience. For, not to dissemble, but to deal plainly with them, she neither might nor would forsake the religion wherein she was educated and brought up, believing the same to be the true religion, and grounded upon the word of God. Besides, she knew that if she should change her religion it would lose her the friendship of the king of France and other great princes, her friends and confederates, whose displeasure she would be loth to hazard, knowing no friendship that might countervail theirs. Therefore she desired all her loving subjects who have had experience of her goodness, how she had neither in times past, nor yet in time coming did intend to force the consciences of any one, but to permit every one to serve God in such manner as they are persuaded

to be the best; that they likewise would not urge her to any thing that stood not with the quietness of her own mind.

That to establish the superintendent church, they knew the same could not be done but by consent of the three estates in parliament. And how soon the same should be convened, whatsoever the estates should condescend unto, her majesty should thereto agree, assuring them in the meanwhile that none should be troubled for using themselves in religion according to their consciences, and so should have no cause to fear any peril to their lives or heritages.

That her majesty did not think it reasonable that she should defraud herself of so great a part of the patrimony of the crown, as to put the patronages of the benefices forth of her own hands, seeing the public necessities of the crown did require a great part of the rents to be still retained. Notwithstanding, her majesty was pleased that her own necessity being supplied, after it should be considered what might be a reasonable sustentation to the ministers, a special assignation should be made to them, forth of the nearest and most commodious places, wherewith her majesty should not intermeddle, but suffer the same to come to their use.

That her majesty's liberality to the poor should be as far extended as with reason can be expected.

And, for the other articles, her majesty promised to do therein as the three estates convened in parliament should appoint[1].

In this assembly, it was ordained that every minister, exhorter, and reader, shall have one of the psalm books lately printed, and use the order contained therein, in prayers, marriages, and ministration of the sacraments, according to the book of Common Order—that is, the Prayer Book[2]. Calderwood is too thorough a presbyterian to give the whole order: he omits the mention of the office of the burial service, but which omission is supplied by Petrie. This was the first introduction of the Geneva Prayer Book. Heretofore the English book had been in use, and which the leaders in the Assembly found the greatest difficulty in setting aside. It was also debated whether the superintendents of Galloway and Orkney might, without prejudice to their episcopal functions, sit as Lords of Session or Judges[3]. Here is another instance of the extension of the number of the superinten-

[1] Spottiswood, 190. — Keith, b. iii. c. iv. 541-2. — Knox, b. iv. 328-9. — Heylin, 159.

[2] Spottiswood. [3] Calderwood, p. 39.—Keith, 538.

dents; and, as if impelled by a fatal necessity, Calderwood adds, "Here ye see superintendent and commissioner are taken for one thing, and the bishops of Galloway and Orkney are called *commissioners* of Galloway and Orkney."

The king, as he was now styled, attended divine service at St. Giles's church, with the view of removing the pretext of religion from the factious and turbulent nobility, who viewed his elevation to the throne with considerable jealousy. John Knox, the preacher, being in the faction of the discontented nobles, bitterly reviled the king, and inveighed against the queen and her whole court. He denounced them as idolaters, and threatened them with both temporal and eternal punishments; adding, "that God sets in that room (of princes), for the offences and ingratitude of the people, *boys and women*—that God justly punished Ahab and his posterity, because he would not take *order with that harlot Jezebel*," meaning the queen. For this insolence he was cited before the queen and privy council; but so far was he from expressing contrition, that he not only justified what he preached, but insulted the queen to her face, and used epithets the most opprobrious, and unworthy of any man to use to the vilest of her sex; besides launching the thunders of his eloquence against that religion, however erroneous in many points, to which she conscientiously adhered, and in which she had received her Christianity. The queen burst into an hysterical fit of tears, an affection to which she was subject, on hearing herself stigmatised as a tyrant and Jezebel, and that for the wickedness of the land the kingdom had been placed under the dominion of a woman and boys. It is probable that John's boldness was increased by the countenance of the leading men in her majesty's council; for the whole punishment of his audacity was suspension from preaching for some months; and in order to throw odium on the queen, and give an air of persecution to the whole affair, Craig, the other minister, refused to officiate during Knox's disgrace, which occasioned a commotion among the people[1].

1566.—The eleventh General Assembly met in December of the preceding year at Edinburgh; Superintendent Erskine of Dun was chosen moderator; but before proceeding to business, the ministers appointed a *fast*, "for avoiding of the plagues and scourges of God, which appeared to come upon the people for sins and ingratitude." This, says Knox, "was the first public fast that was kept since the reformation, which

[1] Spottiswood.—Keith, 547.

exercise became frequent afterwards." Fasting became afterwards a political engine of sedition, but even in Queen Mary's time the hypocrisy of such fasts was seen through and appreciated; for when she heard that the "professors" were at their holy work, suspecting some covert design, she exclaimed, "I am more afraid of that than of ten thousand men at arms."

Spottiswood, superintendent of Lothian, and Winram, superintendent of Fife, that is, the bishops of Lothian and Fife, with Row, minister of Perth, and Lindsay, minister of Leith, were appointed to wait on the queen, and to represent the lamentable destitution of the inferior clergy, caused by withholding the *thirds*. The queen replied to this earnest appeal to her justice and benevolence, that she was always minded that the ministers should be paid their stipends, and if there was any deficiency therein, the fault lay with Pitarro, the comptroller, who had the collection and disposal of the *thirds*, and who was besides one of their own persuasion. The deputies were also instructed to remonstrate with the queen on her majesty's reply to their petition, saying, "that it was no small grief to the hearts of good and christian subjects to hear, that though the trumpet of Christ's evangel had been so long blown in the realm, and His mercy so plainly offered in the same, her majesty should continue unpersuaded of the truth of that religion which they preached and professed, it being the same which Christ Jesus revealed to the world, whereof He made His apostles messengers; wherefore, in the name of the eternal God (with the reverence that became them), they required her highness to use the means whereby she might be persuaded of the truth, such as conference with learned men, and disputation with the adversaries, which they were ready to offer when and where her grace should think expedient. And as to the impiety of the mass, we dare be bold to affirm, that in that idol there is impiety; from the beginning to the ending it is nothing else but a mass of impiety; the author or sayer, the action itself, the opinion thereof conceived, the hearer and gazer upon it, allows sacrilege, pronounces blasphemy, and commits most abominable idolatry, as we have ever offered, and yet offer ourselves, most manifestly to prove . . . . . As we are desirous altogether that her grace's necessity should be relieved, so our duty craves that we should notify to her grace the true order that should be observed to her in this behalf; which is this, *the teinds* (tithes) *are properly reputed to be the patrimony of the kirk, upon the which, before all things, they that travel in the ministry thereof, and the poor indigent members of Christ*,

ought to be sustained, the kirks also repaired, and the youth likewise brought up in good letters."

In this Assembly numerous complaints were made that the ministers were exceedingly roughly handled by the higher classes when they reproved them for their open and notorious vices; blows and even wounds being commonly given in return for their reproofs. It was asked, "If baptism be administered by a papist priest or in the papistical manner, shall it be reiterated?" It was answered, "When such children come to years of understanding, they should be instructed in the doctrine of salvation: the corruption of the papistry must be declared to them, which they *must publicly damn* before they be admitted to the Lord's table, which, if they do, there needs not the external sign to be reiterated: for no papist ministers baptism without water and *some form* of words, which are the principals of the external sign. We ourselves were baptized by papists, whose corruptions and abuses *now we damn*, cleaving only to the simple ordinance of Jesus Christ, and to the virtue of the Holy Spirit, which makes baptism to work in us the proper effect thereof, without any reiteration of the external sign." This shows that the Knoxian church held that there was grace given through the sacrament of baptism; in which they entirely differ from their successors, the Melvillian presbyterians, who maintain that it is a dead ordinance, by which a name is given to the recipient, but that it does not convey the graces of regeneration, adoption, vocation, justification, or sanctification. The superintendents of Lothian and Fife, with Mr. Row, were a deputation to wait on their majesties, and to complain of the non-payment of the ministers' stipends, and also to beg of the queen to listen to a disputation between the ministers and friars. The queen replied, "That she was always minded that the ministers should be paid their stipends, and if there were any fault therein the same came by some of their own sort, who had the handling of the thirds. Always by the advice of her council she should cause such order to be taken therein, that none should have occasion to complain. As to the second she would not jeopard her religion upon such as were there present; for she knew well enough that the protestants were more learned [1]."

This Assembly decided, that a superintendent may not suspend a minister, exhorter, or reader, without the assistance of the nearest discreet ministers; and in the decision of questions, the superintendent was required to act with the advice

[1] Keith, b. iii. c. iv. p. 355.—Spottiswood, b. iv p. 193.

of the nearest reformed kirk [1]. These are decidedly episcopal functions, and the Assembly only enforced St. Paul's commands to Timothy, not to hear an accusation against a presbyter, but before two or three witnesses. This Assembly also appointed Knox and Craig to draw up a form of prayer for occasions of fasting, which they did, and Calderwood informs us it was added to the Common Prayer Book, which our early reformers constantly used.

The intrigues of queen Elizabeth to prevent Mary's marriage had produced a rebellion amongst some of the Scottish nobles, among whom the earl of Moray was the chief. Mary collected an army and suppressed the rebellion, and the nobles were expelled the country; she was inclined to have recalled them, and to forget their treason, but by the advice of her uncle, the Cardinal of Lorraine, she summoned a parliament to meet in March, and commanded the banished lords to appear at its bar. In this parliament the popish prelates were restored to their seats; but it was prorogued in consequence of the disgraceful assassination of David Rizzio, the queen's private secretary, in her presence. After participating in this inhuman deed, the king, without consulting the queen, issued a proclamation commanding all who had come to Edinburgh for the meeting of parliament to depart the city within twelve hours, on pain of death. In her letter to the archbishop of Glasgow, giving an account of this most barbarous murder, to be communicated to the court of France, the queen says: "The spiritual estate being placed therein (in parliament) in the ancient manner, tending to have done some good, anent restoring the old religion, and to have proceeded against our rebels (the banished lords), according to their demerits: which as for such occasions as are notoriously known, we thought necessarily should be punished [2]." M'Crie roundly accuses queen Mary of having signed a bond for the *extirpation* of the protestants, and cites Bishop Keith for his authority. This is a gratuitous assumption, arising out of that malignant hatred which the presbyterian party have ever entertained for the memory of that most charitable and ill-used princess. Bishop Keith cites part of a letter from Randolph to Cecil, of the 6th of February, as follows:—"Since that time there came from France, Clornau, by land, from the Cardinal of Lorraine, and Thornton, by sea, from the archbishop of Glasgow; since whose arrival no good to the lords. Bond to *introduce* popery in all christendom signed by queen Mary, and the

[1] Calderwood. [2] Given at length in Keith, b. ii. c. ix. p. 330-35.

original to be sent back by Mr. Stephen Wilson[1]." But surely to *introduce popery*, and to *extirpate the protestants*, cannot be to the full extent considered as convertible terms. John Knox approved of the murder of Rizzio, and it is by no means improbable that he was in the guilty council's of the perpetrators; for immediately on the queen's resuming the government after her escape from the conspirators, who threatened "*to cut her in collops*," he fled from Edinburgh, and wandered for some time in Ayrshire, where he had formerly excited the inhabitants to sedition. His biographer seems a good deal puzzled to find a plausible excuse for his absconding at this time, and winds up by saying, "it was deemed *prudent* for him to withdraw." And so apprehensive was he of justice that "it does not appear that he returned to Edinburgh, or at least that he resumed his ministry, until the queen was deprived of the government[2]".

By advice of her council, the queen removed to Edinburgh Castle, preparatory to her accouchment, and there gave birth to a son, on the 19th of July, to the great joy of the nation. On her first entry into the castle, she entertained her nobility at a banquet, and reconciled them to each other. And the General Assembly, which was sitting at the same time, sent the superintendent of Lothian to congratulate the queen on her safe delivery, and to request that she would permit the prince to be baptized according to the form used in the reformed church. The superintendent was very graciously received, but no answer was returned on the subject of baptism. She presented the child to the good superintendent, who, falling on his knees, "conceived a short and pithy prayer," with which the queen was much pleased, and listened attentively. Solemn thanks were returned to God for the birth of the prince, in the Cathedral of St. Giles. The prince had been removed to Stirling about the end of August, and preparations were made for his baptism. To honour the solemnity, the king of France sent the count de Brianee, the duke of Savoy Monsieur de Croke, and queen Elizabeth sent the earl of Bedford, who presented from his sovereign a font of gold, "weighing," says Spottiswood, "two stone weight," with a bason and ewer for the baptism. The prince was baptised by Hamilton, archbishop of St. Andrews, assisted by the bishops of Dunkeld, Dumblane, and Ross, in their robes and copes, on the 15th of December, with all the ceremonies customary in the Romish church, the

[1] Keith, App. p. 167.—M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 292.
[2] M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 291.

spittle excepted, which the queen commanded to be omitted. The French ambassador, count de Briance, carried the royal infant from his chamber to the chapel, walking through a lane formed by the nobility and gentlemen, each holding in his hand a "procket of wax." The earl of Athole followed the ambassador, bearing the great sierge of wax, the earl of Eglinton carried the salt, the lord Semple the cade, and the lord Ross the bason and ewer. The queen of England was represented by the countess of Argyle, who held the prince at the font. The earl of Bedford, and the Scottish protestant nobles, stood without the chapel during the service, and refused to witness the sacrament of baptism when administered by a Roman catholic bishop. The prince was immediately proclaimed CHARLES JAMES, JAMES CHARLES, Prince and Steward of Scotland, Duke of Rothsay, Earl of Carrick, Lord of the Isles, and Baron of Renfrew[1].

In the twelfth Assembly, which met in June, superintendent Erskine was chosen moderator. The usual topics, of the increase of certain sins which an apostle said should not be so much as named amongst christians, with the cruel destitution of the protestant ministers, chiefly occupied their attention. A fast was ordered to be observed throughout the whole realm on the two last *Sundays* of July, and the communion to be administered at the same time. The immoral lay minister Paul Methuen was reconciled to the kirk after prostrating himself before the assembled brethren "with weeping and howling." Knox mentions another "supplication by the superintendents, with the other ministers of the churches," complaining most piteously of the poverty and utter destitution of the ministers, by withholding payment of the thirds. This petition was presented to the queen by the superintendent of Galloway, who had recently been made a privy councillor and a judge of the court of session: in consequence he would no longer submit to be styled overseer or superintendent of Galloway, but insisted on receiving his ancient title. He earnestly entreated her majesty to compassionate the ministers, who were really suffering all the horrors of unmitigated poverty; but from the queen he only received "a good answer and fair promises." In September there was a meeting of the superintendents at St. Andrews to receive and read letters from the churches of Geneva, Berne, and Basil, and a copy of their confession of faith; to whom an answer was returned, "that they agreed in all points with those churches, and differed in nothing from them: albeit, in

[1] Spottiswood, b. iv. p. 197.—Balfour's Annals, i. p. 336.

keeping of some festival days our church assented not, for only the Sabbath Day was kept in Scotland[1]."

It has already been mentioned that the Roman catholic bishops and clergy were allowed to retain their benefices during life, but were compelled to pay a third part of their revenues, known by the name of the *thirds;* and collectors were appointed to receive and pay the *thirds* into her majesty's exchequer, where it was appropriated to the exigencies of the crown, instead of being divided amongst the indigent ministers. On the 3d of October the queen held a privy council, at which were present John, archbishop of St Andrews; Alexander, bishop of the *Candida casa* or Galloway; John, bishop of Ross; Adam, bishop of Orkney; and Robert, bishop of Dunkeld, when it was decreed, "that in time coming all small benefices, parsonages, vicarages, and others extending in yearly rental to the sum of three hundred marks, or within, as shall happen to become vacant, shall always be disponed to such persons as the superintendents and assembly of the kirk, after due examination, shall find able, qualified, and efficient, and thereafter nominated and presented to their majesties; which, being so nominated and presented, their highnesses shall admit them, and by their authority cause them to be answered of the fruits and duties of the said benefices; attour, whensoever any bishopric, abbacy, priory, or other prelacy, that have the patronage of such small benefices, shall happen to vaik and fall to their majesties' disposition and presentation, as likewise of all them that are presently vacant; their highnesses promised *in verbo principum* that they shall always retain in their own hands the power and title of the disposition of the said small benefices to the effect above written, and shall cause the persons to whom their majesties dispone the said prelacies and great benefices to consent thereto before their majesties make any right of the principal to them[2]." Notwithstanding this favourable act of council, the distress of the ministers does not seem to have been much alleviated, nor their position much improved; for their complaints increased both in number and magnitude, and they were now feeling the effects of their own injustice to the former occupants, and the irregular and disgraceful manner in which they had usurped the sacred offices of the ministry. It likewise appears that Mary had no intention of superseding the old episcopal possessors of the sees and abbeys which were still

[1] Keith, b. iii. c. v. p. 557-60.
[2] Ibid. p. 161.

to be maintained in the papal succession. In the next December the above act was followed up by an act of assignation under the queen's hand, extending to the sum of £10,000 Scots in money, and 400 chalders of grain, for the stipends of the ministers. But when they were paid, the share to each of the inferior ministers was only 100 merks, or £5. 11s. sterling; and 300 merks was the highest sum paid to the superintendents, who had the expense of travelling throughout their dioceses to defray. Knox was indignant at this procedure, and publicly asserted in his sermon, "if that order for maintaining the ministers ended well, his judgment failed him,—for he saw two parts fairly given to the devil (meaning the Romish clergy), and the third must be divided between God and the devil,"—that is, between the protestant ministers and the queen. The poor pittance that was allotted to these patient sufferers was neither regularly nor fully paid,—the queen's necessities had first to be relieved, and therefore the ministers must wait. They were reduced to the utmost extremity, and their keen resentment produced much discussion in the Assemblies. It at last became a proverb, that "the good laird of Pitarro was ane earnest professour of Christ, but the great devil receive the comptroller."

1567.—The thirteenth General Assembly met as usual on Christmas-day of the preceding year, and Superintendent Erskine of Dun was again elected moderator. The assembly took into consideration the late act of council and the queen's assignation, and after much discussion it was resolved—"Always they most heartily thank the lords that bestowed their labours and pains in purchasing the foresaid assignation; most heartily requesting their honours to persevere while they bring it to some perfection. Nevertheless, the whole assembly *solemnly protested* that this acceptation of the foresaid assignation, for the relief as said is, *prejudges not* the liberty of the kirk to sute (petition) for that thing which justly pertaineth to the patrimony of the same in time and place convenient, in any time hereafter." Commissioners were chosen to divide the assignation of money and victual among the ministers. And it was unanimously affirmed that the tithes belong of right to the protestant kirk, and ought not to be paid to any persons (meaning the papal clergy) "who bear no office in the kirk of God;" and that the censures of the church should be denounced against all those who refuse or neglect to pay their tithes to the kirk only.

The General Assembly were indignant at the queen's preferring the Roman catholic archbishop of St. Andrews to baptize the prince; but that was merely a passing shadow,

compared with the resentment which they felt at his restoration to his ancient jurisdiction, in confirming testaments, giving collation to benefices, and the other subjects usually judged of in the church courts. The archbishop came with a retinue of a hundred horsemen to take possession of his renewed rights; but, by advice of the earl of Moray, the lord provost deterred him from his design by the assurance that his presence would create a sedition and tumult in the city. It does not appear that he ever was able to exercise any of his privileges, except in the solitary instance of divorcing the infamous earl of Bothwell, by whose advice and contrivance, and with his own divorce and other deep and dangerous objects in view, the archbishop had been restored to his ancient jurisdiction. The General Assembly petitioned the nobility and lords of secret council to exert their authority to prevent the archbishop from acting on his commission, stating that the causes tried in these courts did entirely pertain unto the *true Church*; that the setting up of the "Roman antichrist" was a violation of the laws of the realm, recognized by her majesty on her arrival in this kingdom, and by several subsequent proclamations. This was followed by an intemperate letter from John Knox, in which he demanded of the nobility, gentlemen, burgesses, and commoners,—"Whether that this usurped tyranny of the Roman antichrist shall be any longer suffered within this realm, seeing that by just law it is already abolished? Secondly, Whether that we shall be bound to feed the idle bellies upon the patrimony of the kirk, which justly appertains unto the ministers? Thirdly, Whether that idolatry, and other abominations, shall be any longer maintained and defended?"[1]

The mutual good understanding that happily subsisted at this period between the Knoxian establishment and the Church of England, has been already shewn. They looked on each other as fellow labourers in the same sacred cause of restoring the church to the purity and simplicity of primitive episcopacy. The Scottish superintendents and ministers were satisfied that the bishops and clergy of the Church of England had "renounced the Roman antichrist, and professed with them the Lord Jesus in sincerity;" and, as a decided proof that John Knox, the sternest "professour" of his age, contemplated the Church of England to be a sound member of the universal church, he sent his two sons to be educated in the University of Cambridge, where they attended the Eng-

[1] Knox, b. v. p. 317-9.—Keith, b. iii. c. v. 567.—Spottiswood, b. iv. 197.

lish service, were members of the English church, and one of them received his orders and held a living within her jurisdiction. But this is not surprising; for we have Buchanan's testimony that at that time "the Scots subscribed to the rites and worship of the Church of England;" and, consequently, were in communion with that church. John Knox was desirous of visiting his sons at that celebrated university, and projected a journey into England, with the concurrence and license of the General Assembly. At his request, the Assembly required him to write a letter to the English bishops, in their name, in favour of some of the factious puritanical preachers, who scrupled to wear the decent habits of the church. Accordingly, Knox penned a long letter, addressed as follows:—"To the superintendents, ministers, and commissioners of the church within the realm of Scotland, to their brethren the bishops and pastors of England, who have renounced the Roman antichrist, and do profess with them the Lord Jesus in sincerity,—wish the increase of the Holy Spirit[1]." The sentiments of our titular bishops and ministers were in the highest degree charitable towards "their brethren" in England, and plainly shewed that they thought the Church of England had renounced the Roman antichrist, and professed the reformed doctrines, or, in their own words, "the Lord Jesus in *sincerity*," as well as themselves; and, accordingly, they express for them the Christian and brotherly charity which the orthodox and sincere Christians of one national church ought to have for those of another. They prayed that they might be blessed with "the increase of the Holy Spirit;" which is a very different conclusion from the sentiments of the Solemn League and Covenant, which binds all its subscribers *utterly to extirpate* the Church of England. In the conclusion of the letter, they say: "The Lord Jesus rule your hearts in his true fear unto the end, and give *unto you* and *us* victory over that conjured enemy of true religion, the Roman antichrist, whose wounded head Satan by all means laboureth to cure again; but to destruction shall he and all his maintainers go, by the power of our Lord Jesus, to whose mighty protection *we heartily commit you*. From our General Assembly at Edinburgh, the 27th December, 1566[2]."

The above is the original inscription of the letter, as it is to be found in Keith's, Spottiswood's, and Petrie's histories, and also in the manuscript copy of the Acts of Assembly; but sub-

[1] Spottiswood.—Petrie.

[2] Spottiswood, b. iv. p. 198.—Keith, b. iii. p. 565.—Knox, b. v. p. 349.

sequent historians of the presbyterian complexion have altered the address to correspond with the principles which they now choose to fix upon Knox and his contemporaries. It would altogether spoil their speculations were it to be supposed that Knox had ever recognized the bishops and clergy of England as a church of Christ which had renounced, in common with the Knoxian church, "the Roman antichrist." Presbyterian authors have, therefore, altered the superscription to, "The superintendents with *other* ministers," &c.; to indicate that the titular bishops and ministers were of the same rank and office. There is also another omission in the amended address, proceeding from similar motives, and intended to answer a similar purpose. Knox addresses the English bishops as having *renounced the Roman antichrist*, and as professing the Lord Jesus *in sincerity;* but the editors of Knox's history, and other presbyterian writers, who identify episcopal government with the *Roman antichrist*, have found it expedient to leave out that expression, and also the words *in sincerity*, as implying too great a compliment to the Anglican church. They have also omitted Knox's desire for the *increase* of the Holy Spirit upon his southern brethren, because it was an indirect admission that the Anglican bishops and clergy, and their faithful people, already possessed some measure of the Holy Spirit, which all presbyterian authors are exceedingly unwilling to admit. In this letter Knox writes, "We return to our former humble supplication, which is, that our brethren who amongst you refuse these Romish rags may find of you who are the *prelates* such favour as our Head and master commandeth every one of His members to shew to another;" but this would have been inconsistent with the presbyterian turn which it was afterwards desired to give to Knox's sentiments. His presbyterian editors accordingly have altered Knox's words, *the prelates*, into "who *use and urge them*," namely, the clerical habits, because it was now become inconvenient to admit that a General Assembly had ever owned the Anglican bishops as *prelates;* it was therefore advisable, says Bishop Sage, "to *falsify* a little, and *foist* in more *suitable* epithets: to call them not *prelates*, but *users* and *urgers* of the ceremonies[1]." M'Crie glosses over this powerful instance of the prelatical system of our early reformers in the easiest way possible: he says, Knox's sons resided with their mother's relations (who was a native of Newcastle), and obtained their education in the English *seminaries;* whereas, in fact, they

[1] Fundamental History of Presbytery, p. 37.

were both educated at Cambridge, where one of them died, and was there buried, and the other lived and died a parish priest in England. M'Crie says that this letter procured no relief for the *tender* consciences of the puritans, who strained at the gnat of the clerical vestments, while they swallowed the camel of schism and resistance to the powers that be. "Though the superior clergy," he adds, "had been more zealous to obtain it than they were, Elizabeth was inflexible, and would listen neither to the supplications of her bishops nor to the advice of her councillors. Knox's good opinion of the English queen does not seem to have been improved by this visit[1].

These circumstances,—the education of Knox's sons in an English university, one of whom held the living of Clacton Magna, and this authorised letter from the superintendents and ministers of the church in convocation, to those of England,—are decided proofs of the "godly conjunction" and mutual communion formerly noticed, and confirms Buchanan's testimony, that "the Scots subscribed to the rites and worship of the Church of England." This good understanding continued unabated, till the furious zeal of Andrew Melville, by revolutionising the ecclesiastical government of Scotland, which would eventually have procured valid consecation, entirely broke off the communion and friendly intercourse of the two churches.

The dark and bloody revolution of this period is well known, and seldom has there been so much and such systematic villainy practised as by the Scottish nobles against their ill-used and too confiding queen. The earl of Bothwell, who was a most infamous and profligate character, murdered the king by strangling him, and then, to conceal his villainy, blew the house up where he lodged, with gunpowder. Moray beheld the breach between Mary and her husband with secret though well-dissembled satisfaction. The licentious Bothwell, says a modern writer, "had acquired a great ascendancy in the national councils; that ambition which he had long cherished now began to unfold" (of marrying the queen and usurping the crown); "he cast his aspiring eyes towards Mary, and already marked her out as his own, while Mary only noticed him with her favour on account of his devotedness to her service; and he had long meditated the destruction of her husband. Of insinuating manners, he easily acquired the queen's confidence; and his pretended courtesy and respect not only made favourable impressions on her, but taught her to behold him

[1] M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 295.

with gratitude. He appeared to her the only one of her nobles whom she could trust, for she had found them all one day her friends, and the next joining in cabals against her. He was at this time almost at the head of the government, and yet he was destitute of talent and ability. He knew nothing of politics, was insensible to glory and magnanimity, a despiser of patriotism, a man of boisterous passions and unruly desires. In private life he was the same unprincipled man,—ambitious, licentious, prodigal, and libertine; inclined to villainy from his natural disposition, and inured to baseness from a long course of sensual gratification. He was able to form the most criminal enterprises, and equally courageous to put them to the trial. He ridiculed all religion, honour, and integrity; he was haughty and proud, yet mean and a sycophant. His exterior was handsome, his manners pleasing; he was an adept in the practice of those allurements which attract the notice and excite the admiration of the female sex. Reckless of futurity, he only sought the gratification of his vicious, unprincipled, and libertine desires: and he cared not whether he accomplished these by the sword, the dagger, or the poisonous draught[1]." This unprincipled nobleman divorced his own wife, and seizing the person of his sovereign, confined her in his own castle, and where there is no doubt that he forcibly committed a rape upon her person. In an unhappy hour, and on the recommendation of her noble councillors, she gave her hand to Bothwell, whom she created Duke of Orkney. The marriage was scarcely celebrated, when the same noblemen who had recommended Mary to marry Bothwell now took arms under pretence of delivering the queen from a murderer, and to protect the prince her son. The earl of Moray planned all these transactions; but with his usual cautious policy he retired to France till his designs were ripe for execution. The queen gathered forces to dissipate this rebellion, but she was obliged to yield to the superior powers and stronger position of the rebels. This band of unprincipled noblemen and successful traitors stripped the unfortunate queen of her power and dignity, and subjected her to the most wanton insults, and finally committed her close prisoner to Lochleven Castle, kept by the earl of Moray's mother, with the intention of being removed by violence either secret or judicial.

The next day after her commitment to Lochleven Castle, the earl of Glencairn went to the chapel royal of Holyrood

[1] Lawson's Life of Regent Moray, pp. 212, 213.

House, where he defaced and tore all the sacerdotal and other vestments, broke down and destroyed the altar, and demolished all the images and furniture of the chapel. For this sacrilegious assault he was highly applauded by Knox and his brethren; but as it was done without the consent of the confederate lords, many of them were deeply offended at Glencairn for taking upon himself to execute this barbarous insult on their sovereign and her religion without their advice or concurrence. They felt the impolicy of this rash act just at that juncture, inasmuch as the loyal peers were gathering forces with the view of liberating the queen and restoring her to the government. These assembled at Hamilton, to concert measures for her relief: to whom the faction which had imprisoned their sovereign wrote, entreating them to concur in restoring order and government, but they indignantly rejected all communication with regicides and traitors, refused admission to their messenger, and returned their letter unopened. The General Assembly, being then sitting in Edinburgh, interfered immediately to unite the loyal and rebel lords, and prorogued their meeting till the 20th of July, in order to give time for their missives to perform their services. This was the fourteenth Assembly, and which met on the 25th of June, of which George Buchanan, principal of St. Leonard's College, St. Andrews, was chosen moderator; which is a practical instance of the contempt of the Knoxians for holy orders, for George was never in any holy function of the ministry, but was a known and acknowledged layman. The rebel nobles who had now taken possession of the government in the name of the infant prince, moved the ministry to continue the prorogation of the Assembly, and which was done. The ministers Knox, Douglas, Row, and Craig, were commissioned to write to the lords at Hamilton, "to entreat and admonish all persons truly professing the Lord Jesus Christ within the realm, as well noblemen as barons, and those of the other estates, to meet and give their personal appearance at Edinburgh, on the 20th of July, for giving their advice, council, and concurrence in matters then to be proponed, especially for purging the realm of popery, the establishing the policy of the church, and restoring the patrimony thereof to the just possessors, that is, to the Knoxian ministry. The loyal nobility declined the offers made them by the Assembly and the confederate lords, alleging with justice insecurity of person and property, as Edinburgh was at that very time in possession of the rebel faction: but at the same time they professed their attachment to the protestant establishment. The prince's party, however, held a convention, and as their obvious policy was

to stand on good terms with the ministers, they, of their own authority, enacted several laws for the benefit of the church, but which they entirely neglected, when they found themselves strong enough to stand without the help of the ministers. The articles were as follow :—

1. That the acts made in the parliament holden at Edinburgh, the 24th of August, 1560, touching religion and abolishing the pope's authority, should be extracted from the registers, and have the force of a public law ; and that the said parliament, in so far as concerned religion, should be maintained and defended by them, as a parliament lawful, and holden by sufficient commission from the queen, then being in France, and be ratified in the first parliament which should happen to be kept within the realm.

2. That until perfect order might be taken for restoring the patrimony of the church, the act of assignation of the *thirds* of benefices for the sustentation of the ministry should be put in due execution.

3. That the act of council, which was made with consent of her majesty, touching the conferring of small benefices within the value of 300 merks to ministers, should be put in practice; as likewise the act for annuals, obits, and alterages, especially within burghs.

4. That in the first lawful parliament which should be kept, the church of Christ within this kingdom should be fully restored unto the patrimony belonging to the same, and nothing be passed in parliament before that and other matters of the church were first considered and approved.

5. That none should be permitted to bear charge in schools, colleges, and universities, nor allowed publicly or privately to instruct the youth, except such as should be first tried by the *superintendents* and visitors of the church, who, being found meet, should be admitted by them to their charge.

6 and 7. That all crimes and offences, &c. should be severely punished . . . . . ; and that seeing the horrible murder of the king, her majesty's husband, is a crime most odious in the sight of God, &c. the noblemen, barons, and other professors, should employ their whole forces, strength, and power, for the just punishment of all and whatsoever persons that should be tried and found guilty of the same.

8. Since it has pleased God to give a native prince unto the country, who in all appearance shall become their king and sovereign, lest he should be murdered and wickedly taken away as his father was, the nobility, barons, and others un-

derscribing, should assist, maintain, and defend the prince against all that should attempt to do him injury.

9. That all kings and princes that in any time hereafter shall happen to reign and have the rule in this realm, should, in their first entry, and before they be either crowned or inaugurated, give their oath and faithful promise unto the true church of God, for maintaining and defending by all means the true religion of Christ presently professed within the realm.

10. That the prince should be committed to the education of some wise, godly, and grave man, to be trained up in virtue and the fear of God; that when he cometh to years, he may discharge himself sufficiently of that place and honour whereunto he is called.

11. That the nobility, barons, and others underscribing, should faithfully promise to convene themselves *in arms* for the rooting out of idolatry, especially the blasphemous mass, without exception of place *or person*. And likewise should remove all idolaters and others not admitted to the preaching of the Word, from the bearing of any function in the church which may be a hindrance to the ministry in any sort; *and in their places appoint* SUPERINTENDENTS, *ministers, and other needful members of the church.* And farther, should faithfully bind themselves to reform all schools, colleges, and universities within the realm, by removing all such as be of a contrary profession, and bear any charge therein, and planting faithful teachers in their rooms; lest the youth should be corrupted with poisonable doctrine in their lesser years, which afterwards would not easily be removed[1].

The religion then professed was that of titular episcopacy under the government of superintendents, or bishops; but, as already noticed, these governors were not only altogether without consecration and mission, but they were, unhappily, elected by the people, and did not possess those orders which, to use Calvin's words, "had descended from Christ by hand to hand from the apostles." However, such as the Knoxian church was, the estates were determined to maintain it. They did maintain it, and transmitted it to James when he assumed the reins of government; and they bound him by his coronation oath by all means to maintain and defend this true or *quasi*-episcopal church of God. In these articles we have the force of law given to a system which even the presbyterian historian Dr.

[1] Spottiswood's History, b. iv. p. 209-10.

Cook has the candour to admit was *decidedly prelatical*, and which Erskine of Dun, one of the Knoxian prelates, proves by just argument to have been episcopal; "for," says he, "I understand that a bishop or superintendent *be but one office, and where the one is the other is.*" These articles likewise require all teachers to be licensed by the superintendents, and who are also in the eleventh article classed among "*the needful members of the church.*" In opposing the introduction of the presbyterian system, James acted up to the letter and spirit of his coronation oath, which bound him "to maintain and defend by *all means* the true religion of Christ" at that time professed within the realm. From these premises, therefore, the consequence is undeniable, that if Knox's titular episcopacy was "the *true* church of God," as the act affirmed, Melville's presbytery was *not the true church*, and therefore, as an innovation and destruction of that polity which his coronation oath *required him* "to maintain and defend," he acted *consistently and conscientiously* in opposing "*by all means*" the introduction of the presbyterian model.

On the dissolution of the convention, the lords Ruthven and Lindsay were despatched to the queen's prison, to force from her a resignation of her crown. This was an insult that might have been spared, as the rebel faction had the whole government in their own hands, and had determined on elevating the unconscious prince to the throne before his time, that they might enjoy the supreme power, and secure for themselves and friends what still remained of the ecclesiastical property. A resignation under such circumstances could not be binding, and, as her life was threatened, the queen signed an instrument, without reading it, by which she resigned the crown to her son, and the regency to the earl of Moray, her bastard brother, who some time before had fled into France. He was, however, in close correspondence with his fellow-traitors at home; and he suddenly arrived at Berwick, having left France in haste, as that government, knowing his dangerous designs, had determined to arrest him, on the application of archbishop Beaton, the queen's ambassador. He arrived in Edinburgh on the 11th of August, and soon afterwards wantonly insulted his captive sister and queen, by visiting her in her dungeon. There he barbarously insulted her fallen greatness, and added to her misery and distress by openly accusing her, in the presence of their mutual attendants, of the crimes of adultery and murder. At the same time, with the most consummate hypocrisy, he desired her to remember, that all the evils with which she was afflicted were the effects of her sins against God, which were but an earnest

of future and eternal punishment. The afflicted queen patiently submitted to these unmanly, unjust, and uncharitable railings, and begged in tears, that, as a brother, he would spare her life and reputation. "The latter," he said, "is already lost, and as for your life, the parliament must look to that[1]." On saying these threatening words, he flung rudely out, slamming the door. This cruel usage was the more unexpected and galling, as she had ever been much attached to him, and had ever placed a fatal confidence in him, which he repeatedly betrayed, and which she as often pardoned, and again received him into favour; and when she heard of his untimely end, she shed tears, and prayed for his soul's welfare.

The deed of resignation, and the investiture of Moray as regent, were read at the cross with the usual formalities, on the 25th of July, and immediately after, the duke of Rothsay was crowned king at Stirling on the 29th of July. The earl of Morton and the lord Hume, as proxies, took the new coronation oath. The bishop of Orkney, with the superintendents of Lothian and Angus, placed the crown on the infant's head, and John Knox preached the sermon[2]; but Throgmorton, the English ambassador, refused to be present at that solemnity, lest he should seem to countenance the queen's deposition[3].

During the progress of this horrible revolution, the associated lords were greatly assisted by the protestant ministers. Nothing, says Crawford, was preached but rebellion and revenge; and the late king's murder was their common theme. Hatred against the unfortunate queen, whom they stigmatized as the perpetrator, was sedulously inculcated from the pulpits, and devoutly believed by the commonalty, who readily cheered the regent and the lords when they appeared in public, as patriots and protectors of the liberties of the people. A large portion of the people were completely debauched from their allegiance to the queen by the factious preachers, among whom Knox was the most conspicuous, and the most violent in his invectives. "Thus," says Heylin, "the confederates and the kirk are united together; and hard it is to say whether of the two were least excusable before God and man. But they followed the *light of their own principles*, and thought that an excuse sufficient, without fear of either. The news of these proceedings alarms all christendom, and presently ambassadors are despatched from France and England to mediate with the confederates (they must not be called rebels)

[1] Crawford. [2] Spottiswood.—Knox.—Buchanan, ed. 1821, v. iii. 240.
[3] Balfour's Annals.

for the queen's delivery. Throgmorton, for the queen of England, presseth hard upon it, and shewed himself exceeding earnest and industrious in pursuance of it. But Knox and self-interest prevailed more amongst them than all intercessions whatsoever, there being nothing more insisted upon by that fiery spirit than that she was to be deprived of her authority and *life* together; and this he thundered from the pulpit with as great confidence as if he had received his doctrine at Mount Sinai from the hands of God, at the giving of the law to Moses. Nor was Throgmorton thought to be so zealous on the other side as he outwardly seemed; for he well knew how much it might concern his queen in her personal safety, and the whole realm of England in its peace and happiness, that the poor queen should be continued in the same (or a worse) condition to which these wretched men had brought her: and therefore it was suspected by some knowing men that *secretly he did more thrust on her deprivation with one hand* than he seemed to hinder it with both[1]."

When the regent and the associated lords, as they were called, discovered that the loyal nobility were resolved to support the just rights of the queen, and that they were so powerful as to be able to restore her to the throne by force of arms, they found it prudent to court the ministers, and to grant what had been so long the object of their petitions, "with all the strongest grimace they could put on." Knox says, "The lords at Edinburgh seeing this (the power and resolution of the loyal nobility), joineth absolutely with the Assembly, and promiseth to make good all the articles they thought fit to resolve upon in the Assembly: but *how they performed their promises, God knows.*" And, says Bishop Keith, "had this gentleman been as *sagacious* as he was *fiery* and *scurrilous*, he might have learned before this time what was to be expected from the heads of his faction, when the affair of money came into the plea[2]."

The regent Moray summoned a parliament to meet in Edinburgh on the 15th day of December. Great show and splendour were shown at the riding; the earls of Angus, Huntly, and Argyle, carried the crown, sceptre, and sword; yet considerable fears were entertained by the confederates of interruption from the queen's friends, who were much more numerous than they at first suspected. This was called by the associated lords the first parliament of James VI., and it contained of the first estate four bishops and fourteen abbots; of

[1] Heylin's Presbyterians, b. v. p. 171. [2] Keith, b. iii. c. vi. p. 584.

the second, twelve earls and fifteen lords; of the third, three masters, or eldest sons of barons, thirty representatives of burghs, and five officers of state, in all eighty-three members. In the preceding parliament in April there were *nine* bishops; but the spiritual peers were not the protestant superintendents, but the popish bishops, who, although sternly prohibited from publicly exercising their functions, or even privately enjoying their superstition, yet they still constituted the first estate of parliament. There were twenty-one earls at that time in Scotland, and as there were twelve of that rank present in this parliament, Keith does not hesitate to state that it was a "packed meeting only, and consisted of persons picked out for the purpose, namely, burrows to over-vote the peers[1]." Their first transaction was the recognition of the regency of the earl of Moray, which, in such a meeting, was carried without any opposition; and they made resistance to his government to bear the character of high treason. Then, to smooth down the ruffled brows of the Assembly, the meeting asserted the validity of the parliament of the year 1560, and confirmed the acts respecting religion which had been passed in that convention; but which the queen had never been persuaded to ratify with the royal authority. Although this parliament ratified the Confession of Faith, yet they passed over the Book of Discipline without any notice whatever. Neither did they fulfil the promise which the confederate lords had made to the last Assembly, when they stood in need of its moral influence; which was, "to put the faithful kirk of Jesus Christ professed within this realm in full liberty of the patrimony of the kirk *according to the Book of God*, and the order and practice of the primitive kirk;" even although this promise had been made with the express provision "that nothing shall pass in parliament till the time the interests of the kirk foresaid be first considered, approved, and established." So that in reality they very well deserved Knox's indignant reproach; but it is somewhat doubtful whether the Bible or the Book of Discipline be meant in the above sentence. They must have given the designation of the BOOK OF GOD to the First Book of Discipline, which would imply grievous sacrilege in the Melvillians, who afterwards discarded it and substituted the *SECOND Book of Discipline* and Form of presbyterial church-government, and which is the formulary in existence and use at the present day in Scotland.

But that the lords might not altogether break faith with so

[1] Keith, b. ii. c. xiii. p. 467.

useful a body of auxiliaries, and who might resist their authority, as they had formerly done that of the queen, the parliament took the affairs of the kirk first under their consideration. And the Confession of Faith was ratified, and *dissentients* were declared to be excommunicated;—the thirds of the whole benefices were ordered to be paid to the ministers in all time coming, "*till* the kirk came into possession of her own patrimony, which is the tithes." "The matter of the policy and jurisdiction of the church was referred to the consideration of certain lords delegated by the estates; but for the *restitution* of the patrimony, which was *promised* to be the *first work* of the parliament, though the regent did what he could to have the church possessed of the same, *it could not be obtained*. Only the *thirds* of benefices were granted to the church for provision of the ministers; the *superplus*, or what should be found remaining after the ministers were provided, being applied to the support of the public affairs of the estate[1]." "*Item* (says Calderwood), that laick persons present qualified persons to the superintendent or commissioner of the kirk: and if the superintendent refuse to admit (ordain) the person presented, it shall be lawful to the patron to appeal to the superintendent and ministers of that province, and if they refuse, it shall be lawful to appeal to the General Assembly[2]." Thus we see that every public act of the Knoxian church and the state tended all along to maintain the episcopal powers and prerogatives of the superintendents, of which, besides the above, the following act of parliament is a proof.

"Anent the abolishing the pope and his usurped authority, 15th December, 1567.

"*Item*, Our sovereign lord, with the advice of his dearest regent, and three estates of this present parliament, ratifies and approves the act underwritten, made in the parliament holden at Edinburgh the 24th day of August, the year of God one thousand five hundred and sixty. And of new, in this present parliament, statutes and ordains the said act to be as one perpetual law to all our sovereign lords lieges, *in all times coming*. Of the which the tenor follows: *Item*, The three estates understanding that the jurisdiction and authority of the bishop of Rome, called the pope, used within this realm in times bypast, has not only been contumelious to the eternal God, but also very hurtful and prejudicial to our sovereign's authority and common weal of this realm: therefore it is statute and ordained, that the bishop of Rome, called the

[1] Spottiswood, b. v. p. 214. [2] Calderwood's True Hist. p. 43.

pope, have no jurisdiction nor authority within this realm, in any time coming. And that none of our said sovereign's subjects, in any times hereafter, suit or derive title nor right of the said bishop of Rome, or his sect, to any thing within this realm, under the pains of barratry, that is to say, proscription, banishment, and never to bruike honour, office, nor dignity, within this realm. And the contraveners hereof to be called before the justice, or his deputies, or before the lords of the session, and punished therefore, conform to the laws of this realm. And the furnishers of them with finance of money, and purchasers of their title of right, or maintainers or defenders of them, shall incur the same pains. And that no bishop nor other prelate of this realm use any jurisdiction in time coming, by the said bishop of Rome's authority, under the pain foresaid. And therefore of new decerns and ordains the contraveners of the same, in any time hereafter, to be punished according to the pains in the foresaid act above rehearsed[1]."

This parliament confirmed and ratified the Confession of Faith, which continued, through all the changes which the establishment underwent, to be the national standard, till the present Westminster Confession superseded it. It was enacted, that every succeeding sovereign should take the newly adopted oath on his coronation, to maintain the protestant religion as *then professed and established;* and that none but those holding the religion of the state should hold or enjoy any offices under government, except these offices should be hereditary. The discipline and jurisdiction of the church was referred to the consideration of a select committee of lords, delegated by the regent and three estates; but although the superintendents and ministers made the most strenuous exertions for the recovery of the alienated property of the church, and to deprive the Roman Catholic clergy of their preferments, which they had enjoyed from the commencement of the reformation, yet they could obtain nothing but a confirmation of the thirds, that had been before granted them, but which they had never fully enjoyed. Even of this miserable pittance, care was taken to deprive them of a part, for the support of the usurping government. Collectors were appointed by government to collect the thirds, and, after paying the share allotted to the ministers, to pay the balance into the exchequer. It is rather a singular feature in the history of that period, that the Romish clergy were protected by law, admitted to sit as the first estate

[1] Stevenson's Coll. Acts Par. p. 7.

of parliament, and guaranteed in their livings, although they were rigorously excluded from exercising their functions either publicly or privately, under penalty of fine, forfeiture, *and even death*. This was a line of policy which most probably must be attributed to the friendship of the nobility and gentry, as most of the papal bishops and clergy were the younger members or illegitimate sons of noble families.

In this parliament, the subject of the unhappy queen's imprisonment was fiercely debated, some voting for perpetual imprisonment, others for putting her to death, but all agreed in renouncing her lawful authority, and continuing the usurpation of her son. The rebels and regicides of this reign were the great prototypes and examples of those of a subsequent period; when, acting on the arguments now advanced by Knox and Buchanan[1], and the precedent established by the confederates, they rose in arms against the Lord's anointed, and murdered her grandson, under pretence of the power of the people,—that many-headed, but headless monster. Buchanan laboured to prove the pernicious doctrine that the supreme power of the Scottish nation was in the people, and that the sovereign was merely their delegate; and consequently that he was under their control and censure, and might be deposed or otherwise punished. This was the working out of the Genevan system; but it had also a close affinity to popery, for by this base means the people were taught not only to arraign their prince, but that the ministers might excommunicate him at their pleasure. But we are taught to pray for kings and for all in authority; and to obey them not only for wrath but also for conscience sake; for they are expressly declared to be God's ministers to execute His laws, for there is no power but of Him, and that is ordained by Him. And it is emphatically added, "Whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation[2]." "So excellent a proficient," says Heylin, "did this man shew himself in the school of Calvin, that he might worthily have challenged the place of divinity reader in Geneva itself[3]." But the sovereign can politically do no wrong; for the most despotic prince acts entirely by advice of his constitutional advisers,—is amenable to none but God,—is the source and fountain of all law, justice, and power,—and cannot be judged by subjects. There is no law in existence for that purpose; no judge has, or can have, a commission to try the sove-

[1] De Jure Regni apud Scotos. [2] Rom. xiii. 1—8.
[3] History of Presbyterians, b. v. p. 169.

reign, for who is to give it? The sovereign will not,—the people cannot,—and whoever takes that authority is a rebel, whether it be done by solemnity of parliament, or the individual act of a successful usurper. It was finally determined to keep the queen in perpetual imprisonment; which there is little doubt would have been extremely brief, as the usurping government would never have known peace or security during her lifetime, and while there was a possibility of escape or rescue by her loyal nobility, who were both numerous and powerful.

The sixteenth General Assembly met in Edinburgh on the 25th of December, and John Row, minister of Perth, was chosen moderator. Complaints were preferred against several of the superintendents for neglecting the visitation of their dioceses; and the superintendent of Orkney was deposed from his functions for having performed the ceremony of marriage between the queen and Bothwell, notwithstanding the recommendation of the very noblemen who now administered the government. The persecuted queen was punished therefore for marrying Bothwell on the recommendation of a large majority of her nobles. The bishop of Galloway was rebuked for having neglected the oversight and government of his diocese for the preceding three years, for attending at court and privy council, and for having been appointed a judge of the Court of Session. The countess of Argyle was condemned to do penance in the chapel royal Stirling, and to be openly rebuked, for having assisted at the baptism of the duke of Rothsay by a Roman Catholic bishop[1]; and it was left to the authority of the superintendent of Lothian to appoint the time and manner of her penance,—a mark of superiority in that office which has been already noticed.

It will be seen in the preceding pages how differently the reformation of religion was effected in Scotland and in England. In the latter country the unruly passions of the sovereign prompted him to relieve the Church of England from the unjust oppresson of the pope's dominion. This important step gave the illustrious governors of that church freedom to take such orders with her affairs as the long oppression and the manifold corruptions of the papacy had produced; for it has been well remarked that "*the papal supremacy is the* REAL PIVOT *of papal error.*" In removing the real pivot of papal error, Henry VIII. prohibited all appeals and resort to

[1] Spottiswood, b. v. p. 251.—Keith, b. iii. c. vi. pp. 586-8.—Calderwood's True History, p. 44.

the see of Rome; procured the church of England to acknowledge him as the supreme temporal head of the church in England, and to promise *in verbo sacerdotii*, which was equivalent to an oath, neither to promulge nor execute any ecclesiastical constitutions without his consent and authority; and after that he passed the famous act for suppressing for ever the pope's usurped power in England. He then ordered the Bible to be translated and published in English, and the free perusal of it to all his people, which had formerly been forbidden; and commanded the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the public prayers, to be read in the English tongue. The papal tyranny having been removed, the episcopate, from its natural elasticity, had room to act and expand. Cranmer and the other Anglo-reformers were actuated by the most astonishingly comprehensive and liberal views, for the age in which they lived, and for the circumstances under which they were placed. "The great essential truths of religion they lay down with precision, and enforce with energy; yet with a latitude so judicious as to allow men with very various shades of opinion to subscribe the same confessional, and to unite in the same communion and fellowship, though differing in the modes in which they apprehend and in which they explain the fundamental truths which they all equally allow. The Church of England seems intentionally to have opened her arms so wide as to embrace all within her pale who rejected the errors of the church of Rome and of the anabaptists, whatever minute differences might subsist among the various individuals and parties which it was thus her object to combine. . . . . The practical system of the church of England, as happily settled by Cranmer and his coadjutors, *bears a strong resemblance to that of the first Christians*; and it was unhappily interrupted, as theirs was, *by the fire of persecution and the fervour of speculative dissention*[1]."

In the first attempt at a reformation in Scotland, the favourers of the new doctrines were content to petition for toleration, and the quiet enjoyment of their worship without entering into speculative schemes of church government. As their numbers increased their views expanded, and nothing short of the entire demolition of the papal church would satisfy their ambition. The nobles saw, from the weakness of the crown, that they might possess themselves of the lands belonging to the cathedral churches and to the monastic bodies, and therefore they encouraged and supported the polemical views of

[1] Bp. Walker's Life of Cranmer, in Scot. Episc. Mag. 1821, p. 7.

Knox and his coadjutors. Hence the reformation in Scotland, commenced and continued in rebellion and armed resistance to the powers then in being, and antimonarchical and rebellious principles throughout the whole history of the Knoxian and Melvillian communions were incorporated in their constitutions. The Scottish protestants, however, used the English liturgy for a number of years; till Calvin denounced it as containing "many tolerable fooleries . . . . and many relics of the dregs of popery; and that though it was lawful to begin with such beggarly rudiments, yet it behoved the learned, godly, and grave ministers of Christ to set forth something *more refined from filth and rustiness*[1]." Knox accordingly, being slavishly bound to the opinions of this enemy of the church's peace, gradually introduced Calvin's liturgy, and which was called the *Book of Common Order*, a copy of which was republished in the year 1840, and which is divested of what he called "tolerable fooleries,"—"filth and rustiness," and it is more nearly allied to the Geneva doctrines. They used the Apostle's Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Doxology; but which the presbyterians have entirely laid aside, and, instead, have adopted the solemn league and covenant. Knox himself was in holy orders; but his friend Calvin, whose person he held in admiration[2], never was in orders: hence Knox taught his followers to despise the apostolic succession of the episcopal order, and the laying on of hands. If any man was thought *qualified*, and he was elected by the people and recognised and inducted by the superintendent, it was sufficient to constitute what they called a minister of the gospel. The superior or *quasi* episcopal order of the superintendents had no other ordination than the answering of certain questions, a few prayers, and the acclamation of the people then present. Knox himself inaugurated the whole of the superintendents; and in the face of apostolic practice and that of the whole church, besides St. Paul's careful instructions to Timothy, he judged the ancient and universal rite of the laying on of hands not necessary. This daring omission continued till about the year 1592, when king James insisted upon its resumption, and then they were mere laymen who did lay on hands; all the Romish priests who had renounced popery had long before that time been removed to another world.

Notwithstanding this uncanonical condition of the Knoxian establishment, which it is to be feared brought it within the woe pronounced by St. Jude—"Woe unto them! for they have

[1] Heylin's Hist. b. vi. 207, 208. [2] Jude ver. 16.

gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam (covetousness and sacrilege) for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core;" yet they were only a degree worse than the Scoto-papal church had been before. At the period of the reformation it seems very doubtful if many of the bishops were in holy orders at all, but were mere laymen. From the king down through the different gradations of the peerage, the higher preferments in the church were bestowed on the younger members of their families and on their illegitimate issue. For some time preceding the reformation, the popes had conceded to the Scottish kings the privilege of nominating to all the vacant bishoprics, abbacies, and priories in the kingdom. Many persons were accordingly preferred who, from their age and characters, were unworthy of such places, and who were never ordained to any holy function whatever in the church. Boys, and sometimes children, were presented and installed, and, when of age, sat in parliament as bishops, abbots, and priors, though they were mere laymen. By this fraudulent and sacrilegious usurpation the rents and revenues of the church were appropriated and became the private property of the fathers of these commendators while they were under age. As a natural consequence, these lay prelates having neither clerical education nor good moral dispositions, brought the greatest reproach upon the church by their immoral and vicious lives; for being sworn to celibacy, they indulged in every criminal excess of lust and riotous living. The sacred functions of their offices were entirely neglected, or if performed, being the usurpation of laymen, were null and void; and their example introduced such a deluge of ignorance, and every species of vice, amongst all ranks, as loudly demanded a reformation, and gave the protestant ministers too good an excuse for assailing their characters. We do not, however, find that morality was at all improved under their successors; but rather grew more relaxed. The principal topic which occupied the attention of every General Assembly was the continual increase of the dreadful sins of fornication, adultery, incest, and bestiality; of which even the ministers themselves were frequently accused. "Had none," says Bishop Keith, "but pious and prudent men set about the work of reformation, and had they put their hands to the *real* abuses *only*, we in this kingdom might have obtained a reformation preferable perhaps to that of any other country: and how greatly had that age and posterity applauded their conduct, and been obliged to their labours! But, to our grievous misfortune, things went too

much otherwise. And because the ignorance and viciousness of a great many of the then priests was too visible either to be denied or palliated, therefore the leaders (or I might more justly say the leading man) of the reformation presumed boldly to declare against the order of *priesthood* altogether, and to introduce in its room a new-fashioned sort of *ministry*, unknown to the christian church for all preceding generations: a model, by its own inward constitution, *the fruitful source* of innumerable *subdivisions and schisms*, in so far that it subjects the *holy order* to the designation of the multitude in the several nations of christendom, and by which, of consequence, the clergy and religion of all countries have an equal claim, and the priests of the Roman church are as truly the ministers of Jesus Christ (upon the Knoxian principle) as any of the reformed, by their having the unanimous voice of the people on their side. In a word, so *intoxicated* was the principal director of our reformation with the extravagancies he had seen in foreign parts, that (contrary to good advice given him) unless he got every thing plucked up that had been before, he could never suffer himself to be persuaded but that popery was still regnant in the land; and unless prince and peer, priest and people, would accommodate themselves to his *devout imaginations*, there was hardly any safety for them at all[1]." We may therefore say of Knox's devout imagination what Archbishop Bramhall said of the church of Rome: "That church which hath changed the apostolical creed, the apostolical succession, the apostolical regiment, and the apostolical communion, *is no apostolical, orthodox, or catholic church*. But the church of Rome *hath changed* the apostolical creed, the apostolical succession, the apostolical regiment, and the apostolical constitution. *Therefore* the church of Rome is no apostolical, orthodox, or catholic church;" and therefore we are compelled to say of Knox's devout imagination and new-made scheme, in which the like changes had been made, that it was "no apostolical, orthodox, or catholic church."

The knowledge of divine truth and respect for their sacred offices must have been at a low ebb amongst the papal clergy, when we find the bishop of Galloway submitting to be newly ordained or inaugurated to the office of a superintendent, and various priests making similar submissions. As for the other bishops and abbots who joined the new establishment of Knox, they were mere laymen, never having been in holy orders, although they enjoyed the titles and revenues of their sees and abbeys,

[1] Keith, b. iii. c. vi. 391.

and sat in parliament as spiritual peers. It is, perhaps, happy, for the well-being of the Scottish church, that the papal line of succession was entirely extinguished, for it is hard to say how many really enjoyed the apostolic character. And therefore, had the Scottish prelates kept up their succession, it might not have been free from taint; but it pleased God to suppress it entirely for the sacrilegious intrusion of laymen into holy functions, and for the flagitious wickedness and cruelty of the whole Scoto-papal hierarchy. For the universal wickedness of the people, the Knoxian devout imagination was allowed, by open and direct rebellion, and in defiance of the sovereign power, to gain an establishment which has led to all the ecclesiastical confusion which has distracted that country ever since. The state-militant in which the protestant ministers lived with the papal clergy, and the rudeness of the age, made them use language and epithets, not only to their adversaries, but to their sovereign, unwarrantable and churlish in the last degree. Towards the queen, in their language and sentiments, they seemed to have cut the ninth commandment out of the decalogue, as the Romanists have removed the second, in order mutually to enjoy their natural propensities: and as the one worshipped saints, carved images, and the creatures of bread and wine, so the other made the chief part of religion to consist in railing at the Lord's anointed, and at the papal hierarchy. Knox's sole object seems to have been to pluck up and destroy the papal church, but he made no provision for supplying the place of the parochial clergy; and, as the popish priests were sternly prohibited from exercising their functions, the whole kingdom was in a manner laid under an interdict. In consequence there were none to administer the sacraments, to bury the dead, or to unite those who were given in marriage; and, being left as sheep without shepherds, the people yielded to the lusts and impure desires of the flesh, and their last state was worse than their first. With the new ministers the sacraments gradually fell into contempt and neglect; and there were instances where the communion had not been administered for more than six years. The whole of religion seemed to consist in preaching, in which the heavenly gift of charity was entirely thrown overboard; "but," says Dr. Bisse, an eminent English divine, "it was a remarkable saying, founded on the reason of things, that a preaching church cannot stand."

CHAPTER VII.

THE SUPERINTENDENTS AND TITULAR BISHOPS.

1568.—Execution of Darnley's murderers.—Queen escapes from Lochleven.—Battle of Langside.—Moray's severity.—Cathedrals of Aberdeen and Moray unroofed.—General Assembly.—Transactions.—Bishop of Orkney absolved.—Fast.——1569.—Duke of Chattelherault claims the regency in the name of the queen.—An Assembly.—The duke courts the Assembly.—Negociations.—The duke and lord Herries committed to the castle.—Petition to separate the jurisdiction of the church from the state.—Remarks on this subject.—Transactions of the Assembly.—Four priests tried, condemned, and pilloried.—A woman burnt for witchcraft.—Several executions.—An Assembly.—The superintendent of Argyle rebuked.—Declaration signed.——1570.—Murder of the regent.—State of the country.—Assembly.—Transactions.—Petitions for more superintendents.—Lennox regent.—Seventy-five prisoners hanged.—The ministers refuse to pray for the queen.—Bothwell superintendent of Orkney.—Assembly.—Ministers utter treasonable words in their sermons.—Commission to treat with the duke of Chattelherault.——1571.—Dunbarton Castle taken by stratagem.—The archbishop of St. Andrews found in it, and hanged at Stirling.—His character.—The queen's friends hold a parliament in Edinburgh.—Lennox holds a parliament in Stirling.—Assault and capture of Stirling.—Regent taken prisoner and shot.—His death and character.—Earl of Mar made regent.—Discharged the collectors of the kirk.—Superintendent Erskine's letter to the regent.—Remarks.—General Assembly.—Petition the regent.—Act for farther spoliation of church property.—Bishop Sage's reflections on this act.—Knox's letter to the Assembly.—Spottiswood's description of the church government.—Number of the ministers.——1572.—Assembly at Leith.—Commissioners appointed.—New polity there agreed upon.—Mr. Fergusson's sermon.—Vacant bishoprics filled up.—Douglass made archbishop of St. Andrews.—His inauguration.—Knox's protest.—Reflections.—Assembly.—Committee appointed.—Act exempting certain superintendents from the archbishop's jurisdiction.—Another Assembly.—An act respecting the titles of offices.—Explanation of the act.—Names of the new bishops.—Act of parliament ratifying the acts of Assembly.—Death of the regent.—Morton elected regent.—Distressed state of the country.—Fast appointed on account of the Bartholomew massacre.—Knox's last sermon—His death—His character—Sentiments—His prayers—His ecclesiastical polity—His recommendation to Edward VI.—Dr. M'Crie's account—His character, by Spottiswood.—Reflections.—Mr. Palmer's mistake.—A parliament.——1573.—Kirkaldy surrenders Edinburgh Castle—His character.—Lethington commits suicide.

1568.—As the Knoxian church had now received the security of a legal establishment by the authority of the late parliament and the unequivocal protection of the secular arm,

we may account that event a new era in its history. The regent Moray went in circuit round the kingdom, holding justice Airs, and is represented both by Sir James Melville and Buchanan, his own partisans, as having acted with great rigour and severity, and not without strong suspicion of having been influenced by political motives; but the English ambassador says in one of his letters: "In Scotland, things are quietly governed by the regent, who doth acquit himself very honourably to the advancement of religion and virtue, without respect of persons[1]." In the month of January, the regent did execution on Hepburn, Hay, Powrie, and Dalgleish, four of the inferior accessories in the murder of the late king. These men "took God to record that this murder was done by Moray and Morton's counsel, invention, and drift committed; and that they never knew the queen to be participant or ware thereof[2]." Yet, on the credit of the forgeries of these two noblemen, the whole guilt has been thrown on the unhappy queen, and most devoutly believed even by sensible men; although writers of acknowledged abilities and integrity have fully substantiated the queen's innocence, and the guilt of the noblemen.

On the 7th of February, an act of council was issued for unroofing the cathedrals of Aberdeen and Moray, under pretence that "provision must be made for the entertaining of the men of war, whose service cannot be spared, while the rebellious and disobedient subjects, troublers of the commonwealth in all parts of this realm, be reduced." Foreseeing resistance to this sacrilege, the council denounced severe vengeance on the inhabitants of those cities who should obstruct the removal of the lead from the roofs. Among the members of council who were present and concurred in this iniquitous act, were the bishops of Galloway and Orkney, and the commendator of Coldingham[3]. Among those to whom the execution is addressed are the bishops of Moray and Aberdeen, and Thomas Menzies, Esq. of Pitfoddels, provost of the latter city, and whose descendant is at present the chief prop of the Scottish Romanists, having conveyed great part of his landed property for a Jesuit seminary at Blairs, in Aberdeenshire. But their short-sighted policy did not serve the purpose for which this senseless sacrilege was committed; for tradition affirms, that the vessel in which it embarked was wrecked, and the lead which had been sanctified by the temples of God was lost. The Cathedral of Moray was one of the most

[1] Keith, b. ii. c. 13, p. 469. [2] Balfour's Annals, i. 343.—Crawfords's Mem.
[3] Keith, b. ii. c. 13, p. 468.

splendid in the British empire; but, in consequence of this sacrilegious act, it is now a shapeless mass of ruins. The history of the queen's escape from Lochleven Castle, the defeat of her army, and her own imprudent flight into England, are well known to every reader of the history of that period. Immediately on her escape, she issued a proclamation, denouncing her late resignation of the crown as an act extorted from her through fear of her life, and therefore null and of no effect; and called on all her loyal subjects to join her standard. After the fatal battle of Langside, her loyal friends experienced the tender mercies of the regent. He plundered Hamilton Palace, and carried off all the money, plate, and other valuables. He summoned all the loyalists to appear before the privy council, to answer for such crimes as might be there objected against them. Some dared not trust their persons in the power of a man whom no laws could bind, and others declined to appear, because they disowned his usurped authority. In consequence, he demolished their houses, harassed their tenants, carried off and sold their cattle, and confiscated the proceeds for the use of the exchequer. In the prosecution of his avarice and revenge he forfeited the estates of all the queen's adherents without even the form of a trial[1].

The General Assembly met in July at Edinburgh, and John Willock, the superintendent of the west, was duly elected moderator, which dignity he at first refused to accept, on account of the factious, disorderly conduct of the ministers, where all would command, and none would obey; "for even then," says Spottiswood, "the multitudes that convened, and the indiscreet behaviour of some who loved to seem more zealous than others, did cause a great confusion." Due obedience, however, having been promised, the superintendent of the west took his seat as president of the Assembly. It was then enacted, "That none should be admitted to have voice in these Assemblies but superintendents, visitors of churches, commissioners of shires and universities, and such ministers as the *superintendents should choose* in their diocesan synods and bring with them, being men of knowledge, and able to reason and judge of matters that should happen to be propounded." And, "that no matters should be moved which the superintendents might and ought to determine in their synods." Some severe acts were passed against those who still adhered, in spite of the penal laws, to the church of Rome, and excommunication was denounced against all obstinate papists. Threatenings of ecclesiastical

[1] Crawford's Memoirs.

wrath were vented also against those guilty of a fearful list of the most horrid and unnatural crimes, with which the country seems to have been filled: "That papists, continuing obstinate after lawful admonition, should be excommunicated; and that the committers of murder, incest, adultery, and other such heinous crimes, should not be admitted to make satisfaction by any particular church till they did first appear in the habit of penitents before the General Assembly, and there receive their injunctions." A committee was appointed, including John Knox, to revise and draw up a form of excommunication, which was approved and added to the Geneva Prayer Book, then in use. Before the Assembly broke up, the bishop of Orkney, on his own petition, was absolved from his former sentence of deposition, and restored to his functions, and ordained to make an apology in his sermon, to be preached in the chapel-royal, Holyrood House, "and crave forgiveness of God, the church, and estate, which he had offended." The Assembly petitioned the regent, "that the persons nominated in parliament for the matter of policy or jurisdiction of the church, should be ordained to meet at a certain day and place, for concluding the same." To keep the peace with the ministers, who were complete masters of public opinion, the regent acceded, and appointed the eighth of the following August for a conference; but an excuse was easily found for delay; and in the end the conference never took place, and commissioners from the church attended the parliament as usual[1]. The ministers appointed a solemn fast and thanksgiving for the miraculous escape of their patron, the regent, who pretended to have discovered a plot for his assassination by the lyon-king-at-arms and Patrick Hepburn, parson of Kenmore[2]. The lord-lyon was tried and put to death, and the poor parson was condemned and hanged, and his body denied the benefit of sepulture. It is a common trick with usurpers to get up sham conspiracies, for the purpose of getting rid of dangerous enemies, or of consolidating their own power.

1569.—The duke of Chattelherault, on his arrival from France, claimed the regency of the kingdom in right of his propinquity of blood to the crown. He issued a proclamation commanding the subjects to acknowledge no other authority than that of their lawful sovereign queen Mary, whose commission as regent he held. In it he complained, "that being nearest of blood to the crown, and consequently tied to its in-

[1] Calderwood's True History, p. 45.—Spottiswood, b. v. p. 219.
[2] Balfour's Annals, i. 315.

terests, a few tumultuous persons had nevertheless preferred to the highest dignity in the kingdom a man base born, and one whose ambitious practices rendered him unfit for so great a trust;" adding, "that he was duly appointed regent by the queen, and if acknowledged, he would speedily put an end to the civil war, and restore his banished sovereign without expense of blood." Queen Elizabeth had acquired the sovereignty of Scotland through the guilt of Moray and his party, and who were completely subservient to her will; it was therefore her interest to support him, and crush the rising hopes of the loyal nobility in the advancement of the duke of Chatteherault to the regency. She openly protested against the duke's project, and threatened to invade the kingdom in support of her creature Moray, who issued a counter proclamation, charging the lieges, in the king's name, to meet him at Glasgow. Thus the crime of depriving the queen of her birthright steeped the kingdom in greater guilt, as "crowns by blood acquired, must be by blood maintained."

The General Assembly being convoked at the same time in Edinburgh, the duke addressed a letter to them, in which he stated his claims, and appealed to them as the ministers of peace to assist him in his anxious design of pacifying the country, and prayed them, "in God's behalf, to make his mind and intention known to the people." He likewise requested them to send some of their number to "reason with himself, whom they should find easy to be ruled in all matters according to God's word and equity." To this letter the assembly cautiously replied, "that they should communicate his grace's letter to the regent, and ascertain whether it was his pleasure that they should send any of their number to treat with the duke." Accordingly, the Assembly appointed the superintendents of Lothian and Fife, with John Row, minister, to treat with the regent for license to hold a conference with the duke. The regent's license seems to have been obtained; and the superintendents so far succeeded in their mission that the duke agreed to go to Glasgow and submit himself to the regent's authority; stipulating, however, that he and his friends should be restored to their honours and possessions. On the other hand, Moray required that the duke should give security for the continuance of himself and his friends in obedience to the existing government, when they should all be accepted. The earls of Argyle and Huntly refused to be included in this agreement; and, before the security was given, the duke himself began to regret the facility with which he had compromised the rights of his sovereign. He came to Edinburgh,

but desired to procrastinate his submission till the month of May, when the two earls might be expected, and the queen's will known. He was informed that the two earls were treating separately for themselves, and he was asked what he intended to do in case the queen should refuse her consent. He answered, with more ingenuousness than prudence, "that he was drawn against his will to make the promise he had made, and that if he were freed of it he would never consent to the like." This answer being deemed unsatisfactory, the duke and the Lord Herries who accompanied him, were committed close prisoners to the Castle[1]. Sir James Balfour says, "In February of the year 1569, the earl of Moray, regent, returned out of England, where he had remained since the 21st of September in the preceding year. The regent having laid a sure foundation for the young king with Queen Elizabeth, and also *lulled Queen Mary asleep with hopes of her enlargement, that he might the more easily catch her friends*, calls a convention of the estates of the realm to meet at Edinburgh, immediately after his return. Amongst the first, come the Duke of Chatelherault and the Lord Herries; them both he catches, and commits to close prison in the Castle of Edinburgh[2]."

The commissioners were also intrusted with petitions from the church, to be presented to the regent, to whom they were far more obedient and respectful than they had been to their lawful sovereign, to request that beneficed persons not having functions in the church, or in other words, the Roman Catholic incumbents, and subject only to payment of thirds, should be compelled to contribute for sustentation of the poor; that a remedy might be provided against the chopping and changing of benefices, diminution of rentals, and subletting of tithes on long leases, on purpose to defraud the protestant ministers and their successors; that pluralities might be abolished; that *the jurisdiction of the church might be separated from the state*; and that, without incurring his grace's or the privy council's displeasure, they might launch the Assembly's thunders at the earl of Huntly, who had displaced the church's collectors, and substituted his own in their place, and by his own authority[3].

"Such respect," says Spottiswood, "was carried at that time to the civil power, as the church could not proceed in censures against men in prime places without their knowledge:

[1] Spottiswood, b. v. p. 28.—Crawford's Memoirs, p. 121.
[2] Annals, i. 349.
[3] Spottiswood, b. v. p. 228.

the neglect whereof in after times brought with it great troubles both to the church and state." The spirit of resistance to the supreme power was gradually unfolded as the Knoxian church began to yield its pretensions to the Melvilian, which was entirely based on resistance to the authority of both the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. Yet in this petition there is a strong step made in advance, by the superintendents petitioning the regent to separate the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions, in imitation of the gradual encroachments of the pope, who commenced by exempting the clergy and spiritual persons from the secular powers. This claim of exemption was afterwards, when the presbyterians were struggling with the crown for an establishment, carried to the full extent of entire exemption from the power of the civil judge. It is the prerogative of the crown to call synods of the clergy, and to preside in them, and, in consequence, to give ecclesiastical canons or decrees the force of civil law, which the clergy of themselves cannot do. The sovereign has found it necessary at all times to preside in all the Scottish general assemblies, in order to protect his own rights, and to guard against a strong inclination in that body to assume to themselves the exercise of the civil power and its prerogatives. Some ecclesiastical causes are founded on the civil laws, such as the probate of wills, certificates of bastardy, legal divorces, and similar causes; which, although in their own nature they may be spiritual, yet they have the temporal penalties annexed to them of heresy, excommunication, &c., and consequently must be cognizable by the civil law. The Assembly were now disposed to draw all such causes to their own bar as had formerly been judged by the archbishop of St. Andrews, and the other popish bishops, in their consistory courts. But the spirit of resistance to the civil power had not yet taken full possession of the assemblies—that spirit, which should be driven out into a herd of swine, was reserved for another system which had not as yet been mooted; and it was not till the ministers disputed the authority and place of the superintendents, that they fell from one evil to another, and set at nought the just authority of the sovereign, which is called by St. Paul "the ordinance of God." This Assembly decreed that the University of St. Andrews should confer degrees in divinity on competent persons; and also ordained that superintendents should command the readers, who held an office equivalent to deacons in the church, to abstain from administering the sacraments, under the pain of being accused as abusers, and criminal[1].

[1] Calderwood's True Hist. 45.—Spottiswood, b. v. p. 228.

As a proof of the zeal with which the regent was now actuated for the advancement of the protestant cause, he arrested four Roman Catholic clergymen at Dunblane, who were tried and readily convicted of having celebrated mass, and they were condemned to be hanged, in terms of the act of parliament; but, by an ostentatious display of mercy, he commuted their sentence from the gallows to being baited at the stake by the rabble. He ordered them to be chained to the market-cross at Stirling, habited in their vestments, with their books and chalices collected beside them. When the rabble had pelted their persons with stones, filth, and other missiles, for the space of an hour, their books and vestments were burnt by the hands of the common hangman. At St. Andrews, Mother Nicknevin, a reputed sorceress, was condemned for that imaginary crime, and cruelly burnt alive. Knox was present at this cruel imitation of the papal system, and addressed the wretched woman.

According to the regent's severe policy, Paris, a Frenchman, was executed by his order, as one of the inferior actors in the horrid drama of the gunpowder plot, of which the regent was himself reputed the chief instigator. The noble characters in that tragedy were bound by their own self-interest to keep the secret of Moray's share of the guilt, and, besides, were too powerful for his arm openly to reach; but the inferior actors were easily removable under the colour of law and justice, and execution once done on them, they could not impeach their superiors. Paris solemnly asserted the queen's innocence on the scaffold. The regent hanged William Stuart, the lord lyon-king-at-arms, on a charge of necromancy, but in reality for his firm uncompromising attachment o his imprisoned sovereign [1].

Another Assembly met this year in July, at Edinburgh, from whom commissioners were sent to the regent and parliament, then sitting at Perth, to renew their application of last year, to which they had received no answer, far less any redress;—"that a portion of the tithes might be allotted for the sustentation of the poor,—the labourers of the ground be permitted to gather the tithes of their proper corns, paying for the same a reasonable duty,—and that the thirds of benefices, being really separated from the two other parts, the collectors of the church might peaceably intromit therewith, for the more ready payment of the ministers, according to their assignations." But the impoverished ministers were doomed

[1] Crawford, Mem. 128.—Balfour's Annals, i. 345.

again to feel that disappointment of "hope deferred which maketh the heart sick."

In this Assembly, Cresswell, superintendent of Argyle, was rebuked for accepting the bishopric of the Isles, without having previously received the Assembly's sanction; and for having assisted at the riding and deliberations of the parliament summoned by the queen after the murder of her husband. They approved of superintendent Erskine of Angus's visitation of Marischal College, Aberdeen, and of his deprivation of the principal and some of the professors, and which had been confirmed by government. The regent required the Assembly to subscribe the following declaration; which must be a stumbling-block in the way of those who reckon Knox's polity to have been after the presbyterian model, for here the members of the Assembly are sworn to the maintenance, in strict integrity, of his episcopal establishment:—"We, whose names are underwritten, do ratify and approve from our very hearts the confession of faith, together with all other acts concerning our religion, given forth in the parliament holden at Edinburgh the 24th day of August, 1560, and the 15th December, 1567; and join ourselves as members to the true kirk of Christ, whose visible face is described in the said act, and shall in time coming be participant of the sacraments now most faithfully and publicly ministered, and submit us to the jurisdiction and discipline thereof[1]."

1570.—On the 23d January, the earl of Moray, in passing through Linlithgow, fell by the hand of a vile assassin, which made his miserable country such a prey to factions and tumults, that at no former time had there been such anarchy. After his death the highways were covered with robbers; nor durst the unfortunate traveller who escaped from these banditti profess his attachment either for the queen, or the infant occupying her place, lest he who asked the question should murder him to evince his own loyalty. "In short," says Crawford, "order was wholly banished, justice lay buried and unseen, and many found now, when too late, that the kingdom suffered more in one year by civil war, than by obeying, in many, the most barbarous tyrants." By the intrigues, the gold, and the menaces of Elizabeth, who was the queen *de facto*, Matthew earl of Lennox, and grandfather to the prince, was appointed regent. He was an Englishman born, his whole property lay in England, and, besides, he left his wife as a hostage in Elizabeth's hand, to preserve him firm in his allegiance to her, and to

[1] Calderwood's True Hist. 45.

secure her sovereignty over Scotland, which, by the guilty policy of the former regent, she had acquired. The ministers were dismayed and horror-struck with this inhuman murder; and being at the time in convocation, ordained that, in detestation of it, the murderer, with all the parties concerned in it, should be excommunicated in all the principal burghs of the kingdom. This most detestable assassination was committed by a Mr. Hamilton, from motives of private revenge, and shows the barbarous manners and maxims of the age. Moray was in the thirty-eighth year of his age when he was cut off in this dreadful manner. He recommended the young prince to the care of those nobles who were present in his apartment, and died a little before midnight.

The following are the remarks of archbishop Spottiswood on this detestable murder, with whom the regent was evidently a favourite:—"The death of the regent was by all good men greatly lamented, especially by the commons, who loved him as their father whilst he lived, and now mourned grievously at his death. The great things he had wrought in his life, (having in the space of one year and a little more quieted the state, which he found broken and disordered), made his very enemies speak of him after his death with praise and commendation. Above all, his virtues, which were not a few, shined in piety towards God, ordering himself and family in such sort, as it did more resemble a church than a court. For therein, besides the exercise of devotion which he never omitted, there was no wickedness to be seen, nay, not an unseemly or wanton word to be heard. A man truly good, and worthy to be ranked amongst the best governors that this kingdom hath enjoyed, and therefore to this day honoured with the title of the *good regent*[1]."

This Assembly chiefly occupied their session with making laws and constitutions for their own governance; among others, an act for the inauguration of ministers at their entry, —meaning such ordination as they could give; "whereunto (says Spottiswood) the revolt of some preachers gave occasion, that, forsaking the pulpit, took to pleading of causes before the lords of session." To this course the ministers were probably driven by the state of poverty and utter destitution to which they were reduced by the rapacity and avarice of the nobility, who had robbed the church of her just rights, and by the retention of the benefices by the Romish clergy; and perhaps

[1] Spottiswood. b. v. pp. 233-34.

to the lessons of contentious wrangling which they learnt in the court of session may be ascribed that spirit of resistance to both civil and ecclesiastical authority which unhappily actuated them, and which increased in the succeeding ages. The division of labour between the pulpit and the bar naturally produced a litigious, captious disposition, and an inclination to interfere in all the broils which distracted that miserable kingdom during the sixteenth century; and its misery was entirely occasioned by its misgovernment, rebellion, and ecclesiastical insubordination. The Assembly enacted, that five thousand merks should be paid annually out of the thirds, for support of the prince's household. During the *actual* reign of the queen, Knox vehemently contended against such an appropriation of the thirds, as he said it was bestowing a share of that miserable pittance "on the devil." They also enacted that the complaints *of the want of superintendents* which were so frequently made from many parts of the kingdom, that had not yet been supplied, owing to the scarcity of men duly qualified for the office, "shall be heard and provided for, according to the necessities of the country[1]."

The country was harassed by internal wars and tumults, and by invasions on the side of England. Lennox was queen Mary's bitter enemy, and persecuted her loyal friends and adherents, who composed the greater part of her people, with unrelenting fury. The gallant and loyal Huntly was in arms for her interest, and had garrisoned the church of Brechin, but which was taken by the regent, who hanged the whole garrison on the spot, consisting of seventy-five individuals. Their captain purchased his life with a large sum of money and the greatest part of his estate. John Kelso, a protestant minister, was strangled and burnt for the murder of his wife; and two men, for an unnatural crime, were dipped three times into the North-Loch, into which, at that time, the common sewers ran, and afterwards were *buried alive*[2]."

In the many convulsions and revolutions of the state, which were constantly occurring at this period, the protestant ministers were so far from being passive agents, that they openly aggravated the crimes unjustly charged against the queen. Contrary to every precept of the christian religion, which they ought to have taught, they stirred up and increased the blind zeal of the furious people, inflamed their discontent, and openly preached, "that to pray for, or to forgive our real or

[1] Spottiswood, p. v. p. 235. [2] Crawford.

reputed enemies, was no part of a christian's duty." They applied all their inferences to maintain the lawfulness of rebellion; and "that kings and queens, the Almighty's lieutenants on earth, were accountable to the people, as lawful judges of all their actions." John Knox was incontrovertibly the *head* of the church, being the pope, as it were, over all superintendents and ministers, and although he possessed the richest benefice in the kingdom, yet he set the example of refusing to pray for the queen in public, which was immediately followed by the other ministers. A young gentleman named Innes chalked a severe reprimand on Knox's door, for his disloyalty and uncharitable invectives against the persecuted queen, who required his prayers now more than ever.

On the Sunday after the regent's murder, Knox preached entirely on civil affairs; and after long and bitterly inveighing against her majesty and all her adherents, and paying a high eulogium on her enemies and the usurpers of her throne, with some notes of admiration on treason and rebellion, all of which he affirmed to be the cause of God and religion, he concluded with these remarkable words—"What others may think I know not, neither do I care; but Mary Stuart never was a queen in my opinion, and I am sure she is none now; nor shall I ever be forced, against the light of my own conscience, to acknowledge her hereafter, instead of our sovereign, since God and the people of this land have laid her justly aside for her crying sins." Nor did he stop here, but, assembling the other city ministers, they unanimously resolved, "That for ever hereafter no clergyman should presume to pray for the queen, she being utterly unworthy of such a benefit[1]." The majority of the people were loyal to the queen, and were only prevented from re-seating her on the throne of her ancestors, by the power of the regent, who was openly assisted by the queen of England. Knox's assertion, that her majesty was "laid aside by God and the people," is to maintain that God is the author of rebellion, against which He has denounced the heaviest penalties, seeing it is as the sin of witchcraft, and is almost never repented of, and to call that faction the people, which consisted only of a small minority of the nation.

In the Assembly held in the early part of the year a number of complaints were heard against Adam Bothwell, titular bishop of Orkney, who had been appointed superintendent of his own diocese; one of which was, that he still kept up the

[1] Crawford.

style and title of bishop of Orkney with the addition of "the reverend father in God." This bishop or superintendent was never ordained to any holy function in the church, but, like many of the Scoto-Romish prelates of that day, was a mere layman.

The twenty-second General Assembly met in July, and passed an ordinance to oblige ministers at their admission to protest solemnly that they would never desert their vocation to follow secular pursuits, under the pain of infamy and perjury[1]. James Carmichael, master of the Grammar-school of St. Andrews, brought a charge against Mr. Hamilton, minister of that city, for some points of doctrine delivered in the pulpit. Spottiswood says these points are not expressed; but most likely they involved high treason, for the chancellor and privy council sent a deputation to the Assembly "to require them to forbear all decision in that matter, seeing *it concerned the king's authority*, and contained some heads tending to treason which ought to be tried by the nobility and council, willing them not the less to proceed in such things as did appertain to their own jurisdiction." The Assembly judged this reasonable, and yielded obedience: "so far were they in those times from declining the king and council in doctrines savouring of treason and sedition, as they did deem them competent judges thereof." It was not till after the spirit of Andrew Melville began to brood over the assemblies, that they took, and have ever since continued to assume, the initiative in civil affairs, and to enact laws which were only competent for parliament. A commission was given to the superintendent of Angus and Mearns, with several ministers, to confer with the duke of Chatelherault and the other lords in the queen's interest, and endeavour to bring them to acknowledge the king's authority; and they were authorised to menace these noble lords with the spiritual sword of excommunication, in case they should resist their persuasions[2]. This was an imitation of the papal thunder; neither would it have been an empty threat had the ministers actually denounced it; for it would have involved the loss of the whole property of these noblemen, which would have been thereby escheat to the crown.

1571.—The exhortations of the ministers, and their inflammatory harangues, were of essential service to the regent in consolidating his power by exciting the popular prejudices in his favour, and which induced him to persecute the loyalists with in-

[1] Calderwood, p. 47. [2] Spottiswood, b. v. p. 242.

creased rigour. The castle of Dunbarton was held for the queen, but which the regent was determined to reduce. It was taken by one of the most daring stratagems on record; and John Hamilton, the archbishop of St. Andrews, was found in it: who was marked out for instant destruction, as a loyalist, and as one of the loyal family of Hamilton. He was sent to Stirling, and indicted for high treason, and of being "participand of king Henry's murder." Finding the court determined on his ruin, he conducted himself with firmness and moderation; but as the court could not prove any of the charges against him, he was unjustly condemned, on a former forfeiture of one of the rebel parliaments, and hanged immediately; and to add insult to injustice, he was hanged in his episcopal robes, over the battlements of Stirling Castle,—a lasting memorial of Lennox's sacrilegious cruelty and revenge, and a revolting specimen of the manners of the age. We have now witnessed the murder of two archbishops of St. Andrews; a third was added at a subsequent period, all of which are justified and gloried in to this day,—a sure sign that the guilt of blood sticks to that guilty land, as whosoever says "God speed" to a man is partaker in his sin. The judicial murder of the archbishop was hurried over, in order to prevent Elizabeth from saving him by an exertion of the royal prerogative, inasmuch as she was the sovereign *de facto*,—the regent being merely her viceroy. This sacrilegious murder was the occasion of a civil war, which set the father against the son, and the son against the father, and desolated the kingdom for two years[1].

"This was the first bishop," says Spottiswood, "that suffered by form of justice in this kingdom. A man he was of great action, wise, and not unlearned, but *in life somewhat dissolute*. His death, especially for the manner of it, did greatly incense his friends, and was disliked of divers, who wished a greater respect to have been carried to his age and place. But the suspicion of his guiltiness in the murders of the king and regent made him of the common sort less regretted. *It is said*, that, being questioned of the regent's murder, he answered, 'that he might have stayed the same, and was sorry he did it not.' But when he was charged with the king's death, he denied the same. Yet a priest, called Thomas Robinson, that was brought before him, affirmed that one John Hamilton had confessed to him, on his death-bed, that he was present by his direction at the murder. Whereupon he (the archbishop) replied, 'that, being a priest, he ought not to reveal confessions; and that no man's confession could make him guilty.' But

[1] Spottiswood, b. v. p. 252.—Crawford.

for none of those points was he condemned, nor the ordinary form of trial used, though he did earnestly request the same; only upon the forfeiture laid against him in parliament he was put to death, and the execution hastened, lest the queen of England should have interceded for his life[1]."

Few transactions can more decidedly shew by what evil passions men were governed in the period under review, than the murder of this distinguished prelate, who fell a sacrifice to private revenge under the colour of justice, and to the political and religious distractions of the country; and few men have suffered more injustice from the envenomed tongues and pens of political and religious adversaries than John Hamilton, the last Roman catholic archbishop of St. Andrews. He was the natural brother of the regent Arran, and, according to the prevailing sin of his church and of his age, he was "*somewhat dissolute;*" but there is no evidence sufficient to connect him with the base and unnatural murders of Darnley and Moray. Spottiswood only gives it as a rumour,—*it is said;* and when we consider the reckless and uncharitable way in which the most atrocious accusations were then circulated against political and religious adversaries, such loose evidence as *it is said*, cannot be received as proof by the impartial historian. Although his advice to his sovereign might not have been always the most judicious, yet, amidst all the treachery with which she was surrounded, he remained faithful to her to the last. After the unfortunate battle of Langside, when "all but honour was lost," he attended the unhappy queen as far as the Solway; and on seeing that she was determined to reject his advice, leave her own kingdom, and throw herself into the power of her rival, he waded knee-deep into the water, held back her boat, and conjured her by every argument which his agitated mind could suggest not to trust her person in England. Finding all his efforts vain, he took a final and melancholy leave of his sovereign, as if he had a presentiment of the violent and bloody death which awaited both her and himself. His next concern was to provide for his own personal safety, which could only be done by seeking shelter among his friends, who, although depressed by their recent defeat, were not subdued, but were numerous and powerful. He lurked amongst his friends of the name of Hamilton for some time; but at length took shelter in the strong hold of Dunbarton Castle on the Clyde, which was held for queen Mary. Immediately after the battle of Langside, the regent Moray proclaimed him a traitor, and on whom he would have done execution had he fallen into his

[1] Spottiswood, b. v. p. 252.

hands; but his own murder prevented that act of wickedness. "There is some ground," says Mr. Skinner, "to suspect that the earl of Morton, who had been gaping for the revenues of St. Andrews, and who managed Lennox as he pleased, had been the chief promoter of the primate's hasty fate; for, immediately on his death, he solicited so strongly for the rich temporalities of that see, that by threatening to leave the court in case of a refusal, so overawed Lennox, who could not do without him, that he obtained a gift of them; which, through all the various forms of polity that ensued, he took care not to part with."

Kirkaldy of Grange, who had been intrusted by the regent Moray with the command of Edinburgh Castle, returned to his duty to the queen; and the loyal nobility assembling in Edinburgh, the Duke of Chatelherault summoned a parliament to meet on the 12th of June, in the name and by the authority of the queen, wherein, "by authority of parliament, they ordained the said pretended dimission, renunciation, and overgiving of the crown by the queen, consequently the coronation of her son, and the usurped government of the regent, to have been from the beginning null, and of no force nor effect; and, therefore, commanded all the subjects to acknowledge the queen for their sovereign." At the same time they enacted, "that none should innovate or alter the form of religion and ministration of the sacraments, as at present professed and established within the realm." The act also commanded all superintendents, ministers, and readers, to pray publicly in the churches for the queen, as their only sovereign, the prince her son, the council, the nobility, and the whole body of the commonwealth. On the 13th June these statutes were proclaimed at the market-cross with the usual formalities. Lennox likewise summoned a parliament to meet at Stirling, in the prince's name, on the 28th of August, when he procured a sentence of forfeiture to be passed against the duke of Chatelherault, and all the loyal nobility. Commissioners from the assembly presented a petition to this parliament, craving that benefices may be only bestowed on qualified persons, and that incest and other grievous crimes may be punished. The regent approved of this petition, but the earl of Morton reproached them with contumelious words, and vowed to lay their pride and put order to them. The superintendent of Fife inhibited John Douglas, rector of the university of St. Andrews, and who was elect of the archbishopric, from voting in parliament in name of the kirk, under pain of excommunication; but Morton commanded him to

vote as archbishop of St. Andrews, under pain of treason. In the parliament held at Stirling, the regent Lennox produced the young prince, and made a speech to the estates, during which the prince, looking up to the roof, discovered a hole, in consequence of some slates having been displaced, and at its conclusion archly observed, "I think there is a hole in this parliament." "Ominous words, which, says Balfour, were found true; for in the same month, about the ending of the parliament, there came to Stirling in the night, ere the nobility or town knew, the earl of Huntly, the queen's lieutenant, Claud Hamilton, with the lairds of Buccleugh and Ferniherst; and ere day broke, had possessed themselves of the town, crying 'for God and the queen!' so that those that were for the king and his regent, for the multitude of enemies could not come to a head, but wherever they could see any that belonged to the regent, they killed him without mercy." The lord Claud Hamilton took advantage of the security under which the regent and the nobility of his party lived at Stirling, to undertake to surprise them and revenge his uncle the archbishop's death. A little before sunset on the 2d September, he and a party consisting of 200 horse and 300 foot, started from Edinburgh, and arrived at Stirling about sunrise next morning. The regent was taken prisoner by Scott of Buccleugh, and was immediately mounted behind him, for the purpose of being carried off; but unhappily, "ane wicked fellow lift up his jack, and shot him through the body with his pistol. The earl of Lennox, thus killed by a pack of wicked traitors, who departed the town immediately, and the earl of Marre declared regent, concluded the parliament. This was the hole which the young king did see in the parliament, although he meant nothing less[1]." Lennox was interred, without any ceremony, in the chapel of the castle. He was entirely under the influence of Morton, who had such an ascendancy over him that Crawford says he could have made him forfeit his word of honour ten times in a day. Spottiswood, however, says, that after commending the prince to the care of the nobility, and sending his love to Meg his wife, "he took leave of them all one by one, requesting them to assist him with their prayers, in which he himself continued some hours, and so most devoutly ended his life. A man he was of noble qualities, tried with both fortunes; and if he had enjoyed a longer and more peaceable time, he had doubtless made the

[1] Balfour's Annals, i. 350, 351.—Spottiswood, b. v. 256, 257.—Crawford's Memoirs.

kingdom happy by his government." The queen's parliament at Edinburgh also passed bills of forfeiture against the nobility on the prince's side[1].

At this time the kingdom suffered all the horrors of civil war and the inveterate rancour of domestic faction. Knox being a violent partisan of the prince's government, was obliged to leave Edinburgh and retire to St. Andrews, during the time that the loyalists held that city, and the bishop of Galloway occupied his church and pulpit. On the 5th September, the earl of Marr was elected regent by the prince's party; and the whole kingdom being divided in their allegiance amidst these civil dissensions, the General Assembly took the side of the prince, and issued an ordinance that he should be acknowledged as king, and prayed for accordingly.

In the beginning of November the regent Marr discharged the collectors of the kirk from gathering the thirds, because it was alleged that neither the ministers' stipends nor the part allotted to the use of the king were paid; which would imply embezzlement on the part of that "earnest professour" the laird of Pittarrow, whom the kirk had already consigned to the devil. This, however, was supposed, and not improbably, to have been a plot of Morton's, who had made a simoniacal agreement with Douglass, whom he had presented to the see of St. Andrews, with the reservation of the revenues to himself. On this occasion, Mr. Erskine of Dun, the superintendent of Angus and Mearns, wrote what Calderwood calls "a prolix letter" on the subject of tithes; the part relating to which is here subjoined, and that also which relates to the episcopal office and duties of the superintendents.

He maintains that the tithes belong wholly and solely to the kirk, "which only has the ministration and distribution of spiritual things. Since by the kirk spiritual offices are distributed, and men received and admitted thereto, and the administration of the power is remitted by the kirk to bishops and superintendents; wherefore, to the bishops and superintendents pertain the examination and admission (ordination) of men into benefices and offices of spiritual cure, whatsoever benefice it be, as well bishopries, abbacies, and priories, as other benefices. That this pertains, by the Scriptures of God, to the bishop or superintendent is manifest; for the apostle Paul writes, in the 2d epistle to Timothy, chap. ii. v. 2, 'These things that thou hast heard of me, many bearing witness, the same deliver to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others.'

[1] Crawford.—Spottiswood, b. v. 252—257.

Thus the apostle refers the examination to Timothy, of the quality and ability of the person, when he says to men able to teach others; and also the *admission* (ordination) he refers, where he bids him deliver to him the same that is able to teach others. And in another place, 1 Timothy, chap. v. verse 22, 'Lay hands on no man suddenly, neither be partaker of other men's sins: keep thyself pure.' By laying on of hands is understood admission to spiritual offices, the which the apostle wills not that Timothy do suddenly, without just examination of their manners and doctrine. The apostle also, writing to Titus, bishop of Crete, puts him in remembrance of his office, which was to admit and appoint ministers in every city and congregation; and, that they should not do the same rashly and without examination, he expressed the qualities and conditions of all men that should be admitted, as at length is contained in the first chapter of the epistle aforesaid. The deacons that were chosen at Jerusalem by the whole congregation were received and admitted by the apostles, and that by *the laying on of their hands*, as St. Luke writes in the 6th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Thus we have expressed plainly by Scripture, that to the office of a bishop pertains examination and *admission* into spiritual cure and office, and *also to oversee* them that are admitted, that they walk uprightly and exercise their office faithfully and purely; to take this power from the *bishop or superintendent* is to take away the office of a bishop, that no bishop be in the kirk. There is a spiritual jurisdiction and power which God has given unto His kirk and to them that bear office therein; and there is a temporal jurisdiction and power given of God to kings and civil magistrates. Both the powers are of God, and most agreeing to the fortifying one of the other if they be rightly used. . . . . As to the question, if it be expedient a superintendent be where a qualified bishop is? I understand that a bishop or superintendent to be but *one office*, and where the one is the other is[1]."

It is not surprising that Calderwood has entirely suppressed this remarkable letter, which is valuable in so far as it incontrovertibly proves that the Knoxian kirk was not presbyterian, but that it was altogether episcopalian; the *names* only having been changed, but not the offices, to mark the intense hatred which they felt for the papal church. It is a singular delusion by which they were blinded to the necessity of canonical ordination, and the laying on of hands, which Knox

[1] Bannatyne's Jour. p. 279, cited in Scot. Ep. Mag. ii. p. 26. Anno 1821.

declared to be unnecessary; yet in this well-reasoned letter the superintendent quotes Scripture to shew the necessity and the apostolic institution of the imposition of hands. There is no doubt that Knox intended the superintendents to be permanent officers of his devout scheme, for he himself ordained (that is, in his language, admitted) no less than ten of them, before the Concordat, which will shortly be mentioned, when the old names of offices were restored.

The General Assembly met in the month of August, "and gave commission to certain brethren to go to the lord regent, his grace, and to the parliament, humbly to request and desire, in the name of the kirk, the granting of such heads and articles, and redress of such complaints, as should be given to them by the kirk." At that period parliaments were of very short duration, and, in fact, they only met, as it were, to register the king or regent's edicts, as all things were prepared in readiness before their sitting down. Proclamation was made a month or so before the meeting of parliament, requiring all bills to be given in to the lord registrar, which were to be presented in the succeeding session of parliament, that they might be brought to the king or regent, to be perused or considered by them, and such only as they allowed were to be put into the chancellor's hands to be proposed to the parliament, and none other. The Assembly, therefore, knew what subjects affecting the church would be discussed in the ensuing parliament, and what farther spoliation of its property was to be carried with an appearance of law. Those noblemen who held the church lands had seized them by violence, without any other title than that of possession, because the removal of the Romish hierarchy had left its property without a legal possessor. But an act was made in this parliament, "obliging all the subjects who in former times had held their land and possessions of priors, prioresses, convents of friars and nuns, thereafter to hold them of the crown." "This," says Sage, "was an awakening, an alarming act; those who heretofore had possessed themselves of the church's patrimony had done it by force or by connivance, without law and without title; so there were still hopes of recovering what was possessed so illegally; but this was to give the sacrilegious possessors law on their side. As things should now stand, it would be an easy matter to obtain grants, now that the crown was made the immediate superior: and then there would be no recovering from the laity what was then possessed by colour of law. It was indeed an awakening act, and roused the dormant spirit of the ministers, and set their wits to work. Now they began to see the error

of drawing the new scheme of polity in the First Book of Discipline, and receding from the old polity: now they sensibly felt that making a new scheme had unhinged all the church's interests, exposed her patrimony, and made it a prey to the ravenous laity; and that it was therefore time to bethink themselves, and by their strength and skill, if possible, to put a stop to such notorious robbery[1]." Accordingly, Knox wrote to the Assembly which was then sitting at Stirling,—"Because the daily decay of natural strength doth threaten me with a certain and sudden departing from the misery of this life, I exhort you, brethren, yea, in the fear of God, I charge you, to take heed to yourselves, and the flock over which God hath placed you ministers. What your behaviour should be, I am not now, nor have I need, as I think, to express, but to charge you to be faithful I dare not forget. And unfaithful ye shall be counted before the Lord Jesus, if, with your consent, directly or indirectly, you suffer unworthy men to be thrust into the ministry of the church, under whatsoever pretext. Remember the Judge before whom we must give account, and flee this as you would eschew hell fire. This will be a hard battle, I grant; but there is a second will be harder,—that is, to withstand the merciless devourers of the church's patrimony. If men will spoil, let them do it to their own peril and condemnation; but communicate ye not with their sins, of what estate soever they be, neither by consent nor silence, but with public protestation make known to the world, that ye are innocent of such robbery, and that ye will seek redress thereof at the hands of God and man. God give you wisdom, strength, and courage in so good a cause, and me a happy end[2]."

The murder of the earl of Lennox, the regent, threw affairs into confusion, and nothing farther was done at that time; but his successor, the earl of Marr, appointed a meeting of the Assembly, for the following January, for the adjustment of all the matters in dispute.

"At this time," says Spottiswood, "the churchmen began to think somewhat more seriously of the policy of the church than before; for the first draught being neither liked universally among themselves, nor approved by the council, they saw it needful to agree upon a certain form of government that might continue. Unto this time the church had been governed by superintendents and commissioners of counties, as they were

[1] Fund. Ch. of Presbytery, p. 181, 182.—Spottiswood, b. v. p. 258.
[2] Spottiswood, b. v. pp. 257-8.

then named. The commissioners were alterable, and were either changed, or had their commissions renewed, in every Assembly. The superintendents held their office during life, and their power was *episcopal;* for they did elect and ordain ministers, they presided in synods, and directed all church censures; neither was any excommunication pronounced without their warrant. They assigned the stipends of the ministers, directing the collectors (who were then chosen by the General Assembly) to distribute the thirds of benefices, as they thought convenient. If any surplusage was found in the accounts the same was given by their appointment to the supply of the public state; and in such respect were they with all men, as notwithstanding the dissensions that were in the country, no exceptions were taken at their proceedings by any of the parties, but all concurred in the maintenance of religion, and in the treaties of peace made, that was ever one of the articles; such a reverence was in those times carried to the church, the very form purchasing them respect. But the church considering that things could not long continue in that state, the superintendents being grown in years, and most of them serving on their own charges, which burthen it was not to be hoped others when they were gone would undergo, thought meet to intercede with the regent and estates, for establishing a sure and constant order in providing men to those places, when they should fall void, and settling a competent moyen for their entertainment. To this effect, commission was given to the superintendents of Lothian, Fife, and Angus, and with them were joined David Lindsay, Andrew Hay, John Row, and George Hay. These were appointed to attend the parliament, and deal with the regent and estates, that some course might be taken in that business. But the regent's death, and the troubles which thereupon issued, made all to be continued for that time[1]."

So heavy had the Knoxian interdict fallen upon the land, that at this time there were only 252 ministers, 157 exhorters, and 508 readers, and which, with the exception of four, were all laymen. And so scarce were the ministers, that to *one* was committed the administration of the sacraments for the whole county of Peebles. It was many years before the country could adapt itself to "the violent disordered" state which the reformation introduced; and in the interval so much immorality was produced as has never been entirely eradicated[2].

[1] Spottiswood, b. v. p. 258.

[2] Note to Life and Times of Archbishop Hamilton in Episcopal Magazine, v. ii. p. 337.

1572.—On the 12th of January the Assembly met at Leith, "where, after great instance made with the regent and council, for settling the policy of the church," it was determined that six members of the privy council should meet an equal number of members of Assembly, "to treat, reason, and conclude upon that business." The privy council appointed the earl of Morton, then lord chancellor; lord Ruthven; the abbot of Dumfermline; Macgill, keeper of the rolls; Sir John Bellenden, lord Justice Clerk; and Mr. Colin Campbell; and the Assembly nominated the superintendents of Angus, Fife and Orkney, the commissioners of Clydesdale, and the West, with Mr. Craig, one of the ministers of Edinburgh. The meeting took place accordingly; and, "after divers meetings and long deliberation, grew to the conclusions following:" which were, in effect, that the old polity should be revived; only with some trifling alterations which the change that had taken place in religion seemed to render necessary:—

1. That the archbishopries and bishopries presently void should be disponed to the most qualified of the ministry.

2. That the spiritual jurisdiction should be exercised by the bishops in their dioceses.

3. That all abbots, priors, and other inferior prelates, who should happen to be presented to benefices, should be tried by the bishop or superintendent of the bounds, concerning their qualification and aptness to give voice for the church in parliament, and upon *their* collation be admitted to the benefice, and not otherwise.

4. That to the bishopries presently void, or that should happen hereafter to fall void, the king and regent should recommend fit and qualified persons; and their elections be made by the chapters of the cathedral church. And forasmuch as divers of the chapters' churches were possessed by men provided before his majesty's coronation, who bare no office in the church, a particular nomination should be made of ministers in every diocese, to supply their room, until the benefices should fall void.

5. That all benefices of cure under prelacies should be disposed to actual ministers, and to none other.

6. That the *ministers* should *receive ordination* from the *bishop* of the diocese, and, where no bishop was yet placed, from the *superintendent* of the bounds.

7. That the bishops and superintendents at the ordination of ministers, should exact of them an oath for acknowledging his majesty's authority, and for obedience to their ordinary

in all things lawful, according to the form then condescended on[1].

The above articles are from archbishop Spottiswood's History; and as Calderwood's object was to misrepresent the ecclesiastical transactions of that period for the purpose of imposing the belief on his readers that the Knoxian scheme was presbyterian, his account of this Concordat is also subjoined.

They, the twelve commissioners aforesaid, "think good in consideration of the present estate, that the names and titles of archbishops and bishops are not to be innovated, nor yet the bounds of the dioceses confounded, but to stand and continue *in time coming* as they did before the reformation of religion; at the least, till the king's majority, or consent of parliament. That there be a certain assembly or chapter of learned ministers annexed to every metropolitan and cathedral seat. That the dean, or, failing the dean, the next in dignity in the chapter, use the jurisdiction in spirituals as the bishop might have used during the time of the vacancy. That all archbishops and bishops that shall be admitted thereafter, exercise no farther jurisdiction in spiritual functions than the superintendents have and presently do exercise, till the same be agreed upon. And that all archbishops and bishops be subject to the kirk and General Assembly thereof *in spiritualibus*, as they are to the king in *temporalibus*, and have the advice of the best learned of the chapter to the number of six at least, in the admission of such as shall have function in the kirk; as also that it be lawful to as many others of the chapter as please, to be present at the admission and to vote thereanent[2]."

In short, the deputies from the General Assembly, and those from the privy council, agreed that the old polity should be revived and take place, only with some little alterations, which seemed necessary from the change that had been made in religion. This was the *second*, but not a *new model*, of the polity as established in the Church of Scotland subsequent to the reformation, and that too during Knox's life-time, but at a very considerable distance from presbyterian equality among the ministers. Indeed, the episcopal government was so decided and manifest, that neither of the two presbyterian champions—Petrie and Calderwood—have the assurance to deny it, although they attempt to invalidate the legality of that Assembly, and have been followed by all subsequent historians of that particular

[1] Spottiswood, b. v. p. 260.—Heylin's History of the Presbyterians, b. v. p. 180.

[2] Calderwood, pp. 50, 51.

bias. The constitution which was settled by the free vote and consent of this General Assembly was much the same as we have ever since had in the times of real episcopacy. For by this agreement those who were to have the old prelatical power were also to have the old prelatical names and titles of archbishops and bishops; the old division of the dioceses was to take place; the patrimony of the church was to run much in the old channel; particularly, express provision was made that chapters, abbots, priors, &c. should be continued, and enjoy their old rights and privileges as churchmen; and, in general, things were put into a regular course, to continue without alteration till the prince should come of age[1].

Calderwood and Petrie are both exceedingly anxious to invalidate the authority of this Leith Assembly, and, among various other reasons, they object, that the bishops could not be any thing more than the superintendents had been, "from the limitedness of the power which was then granted to bishops." They insist strongly on this very trifling objection, and it is very true they had not any more power; but we have already enumerated no less than thirty marks of episcopal preeminence which the superintendents enjoyed. These were, in effect, bishops, and possessed all the power of bishops, the name only differing, and was any thing but that parity among the ministers, which, Calvin says, "breedeth strifes." Though those bearing the name of bishop had no more power than those who bore the name of superintendent, yet their privileges were more extensive; the former were not answerable to their own diocesan synods, as the latter inconsistently were, but only to the General Assembly of the whole national church. It has long been objected that this was not a free Assembly. That this, however, was not the sentiment of the church itself, is obvious from many subsequent Assemblies having frequently allowed, approved of, and insisted on, its validity; and, even after episcopacy was called in question, it cost the presbyterian party much struggling and many years of contention before they could abolish it. "Would all subsequent Assemblies," says Sage, "have suffered these bishops to sit and vote as such in the national convocations? Would they have tried and censured them as bishops? Would they have put them to their duty as bishops, if they had not owned them as bishops? And, was there any other foundation for owning them as bishops at that time, except the agreement at Leith[2]?"

[1] Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, p. 185-6. [2] Ibid. p. 201.

At the first session of this General Assembly, on the 12th of January, Mr. Fergusson, the minister of Dumfermline, was appointed to preach before the regent, privy council, and the Assembly; and he shewed in vivid but true colours the state of utter demoralization of the people, and the inefficiency of the reforming ministers to occupy the place which they had seized in such a tumultuary and irregular way.

"There the same accusations and complaints that God used of old by his prophet against the Jews, serve this day against them that are like the Jews in transgression; yea, they serve against us. For this day Christ is spoiled amongst us, while that which ought to maintain the ministry of the kirk and the poor is given *to profane men, flatterers in court, ruffians, and hirelings: the poor in the meantime are oppressed with hunger, the kirks and temples decaying for LACK of ministers and upholding, and the schools utterly neglected.* But now to speak of your temples where the Word of God should be preached, and the sacraments ministered, all men see to what *miserable ruin and decay they are come;* yea, they are *so profaned*, that, in my conscience, if I had been brought up in Germany, or in any other country where Christ is truly preached, and all things done decently and in order, according to God's Word, and heard of that purity of religion that is among you, and for the love thereof had taken travel to visit this land, then I should have seen the foul deformity and desolation of your kirks and temples, which are *more like sheep-cots than the house of God*, I could not have judged that there had been any fear of God or right religion in most part of this realm: and as for the ministers of the Word, they are *utterly neglected*, and *come in manifest contempt* amongst you: ye rail upon them at your pleasure. Of their doctrine, if it serve not your turn, and agree not with your appetites, ye are become impatient; and, to be short, we are now made your table-talk, whom ye *mock* in your mirth, and *threaten* in your anger. This is what moves me (let men judge as they list) to lay before your eyes the *miserable estate* of the poor kirk of Scotland, that thereby ye may be provoked to pity it, and to *restore* the things that *unjustly ye spoiled it of.* Cleanse, then, your hands of all *impiety, especially of sacrilege*, whereby ye spoiled the poor, the schools, the temples and ministers of God's Word; yea, Christ himself[1]."

In consequence of the agreement or concordat at Leith, the vacant bishopries were filled up. John Douglas, provost of

[1] Cited by Rev. C. J. Lyon, in Episc. Mag. new series, v. ii. p. 340.

the New College St. Andrews, and who had formerly been domestic chaplain to Morton, was by his influence advanced to the see of St. Andrews; James Boyd to the see of Glasgow; James Paton to that of Dunkeld; and Andrew Graham to Dunblane. The other sees were already occupied[1]. After the judicial murder of archbishop Hamilton, the revenues of the see of St. Andrews were bestowed on the avaricious earl of Morton; but he, wishing to enjoy his unjust possession with some colour of decency, made a simoniacal bargain with John Douglas, his own chaplain, who had been a Carmilite friar, to accept the title, to whom he paid one hundred pounds out of its legal revenues, and appropriated all the remainder to himself. Douglas was in consequence elected *titular* archbishop (titular, for want of real ecclesiastical consecration) and he was accordingly admitted to this archbishopric by the General Assembly, which met at Perth in the following August[2]. The regent issued a commission to Robert Stewart, titular bishop of Caithness, and two superintendents, to consecrate Douglas. "Though," says Keith, "there be *no ground to think* that this person was ever duly, and according to the constant invariable usage of the primitive catholic church, *vested with any sacred character at all*, yet it is a little diverting to observe how the men at the helm of public affairs in those days grant commission to him to assist in the consecration of other men to the sacred office of bishop. I persuade myself the preamble of the following commission will surprise most people:—Our sovereign lord, with advice, &c. ordains ane letter to be made under the Great Seal in due form, direct to the reverend father in God, Robert bishop of Caithness, and the superintendents of Angus, Fife, Lothian, or any other lawful bishops or superintendents within this realm . . . .; commanding them to consecrate the said Mr. John Douglas, elected, as said is, ane bishop and pastor of the metropolitan kirk of St Andrews . . . . . at Leith, the 9th day of February, in the year of God, 1571-2."

Douglas was old and infirm, and held several offices besides, so that it was hardly possible that he could conscientiously discharge the functions of them all. John Knox, who was present

[1] Cruickshanks on this occasion says—"But Satan, envying the prosperity of this infant church, excited some of the statesmen against her, who, having possession of the churches' rents and the prelates' benefices, contrived a method for securing the possession of them for themselves, by getting some *Tulchan* bishops, as they were called, who might have the name of the whole benefice, but receive only a small part of the revenue, leaving the rest in the hands of these nobles."

[2] Keith's Cat. of Scot. Bish. edited by bishop Russel, p. 39 and 216.

at St. Andrews at the time, complained of this accumulation of offices; and when he found that the General Assembly had confirmed Douglas in possession of his pluralities, he remonstrated against their decision, and protested against the union of so many offices in the person of an infirm old man. "Here we may see," said he, "what corruption the kirk has now come unto, that puts more upon the back of one old unable man than ten persons are able to bear; for, after he was chosen bishop, the university continued him rector, which is enough for one to discharge; now, also, he is continued in the provostry of the New College, which likewise is sufficient for one man's charge; besides his bishopric, which six good able men could do no more than discharge that cure; and yet, nevertheless, all this is laid upon his back, a man both unable to travel in body as a man should do, and more unable of his tongue to teach, the principal office of a bishop[1]." There could not, however, be a stronger proof of Knox's approbation, *if his opinion* is to be the genuine standard and authority for the divine right of Episcopacy, than his having preached at the admission of archbishop Douglas. After this event ecclesiastical affairs proceeded in a regular way, only that these titular bishops and superintendents had no canonical ordination, but were mere laymen, and had no spiritual character whatever. Knox not only preached at the inauguration, but he was also one of those who elected Douglass in conformity with the *congé d'eslire;* and therefore, under such circumstances, his protest against the *office* of a bishop, and that too in the face of his own institution of superintendents, whom his friend Erskine asserted were the same in office as bishops, would have been the utmost stretch of inconsistency. Presbyterian authors have asserted that the restoration of the name of bishops was a contrivance of the nobility in the prince's interest, for a general spoliation of the church. The regent himself was really favourable to the Knoxian church; and whatever views of farther sacrilege others may have entertained, his plan of restoring the ancient titles does not seem to have been one of the most sagacious for that purpose. "If the court," says bishop Sage, "had such a design as is pretended, I must confess I do not see how it was useful for them to fall on such a wild project for accomplishing their purposes. Why be at all this pains to re-establish the old polity, if the only purpose was to rob the church of her patrimony? Might not that have been done without as well as with it? Could

[1] Bannatyne's Journal, 331. (cited in Epis. Mag. ii. 33.)

they have wished the church in weaker circumstances for asserting her own rights than she was in before this agreement? Was it not as easy to have possessed themselves of a bishopric, an abbacy, or a priory, when there were no bishops, nor abbots, nor priors, as when there were? What a pitiful polity, or rather what an insolent wickedness, was it, as it were, to take a coat which was no man's, and put it on one and possess him of it, and call it his coat, that they might rob him of it? Or, making the uncharitable supposition that they could have ventured on such a needless, such a mad fetch of iniquity, were all the clergy so short-sighted that they could not penetrate into such a palpable, such a gross piece of cheatery?"[1]

Another Assembly met at St. Andrews on the 6th March, and, according to Calderwood, John Douglas, the newly appointed archbishop of St. Andrews, with John Knox, and several others, were appointed by the Assembly a committee, to meet in Knox's house, to revise the articles agreed on at Leith in January[2]. The result of their inquiries is not recorded; which shews that the articles of Leith had been satisfactory to the committee and the church generally. As certain superintendents had been established within the diocese of St. Andrews, and they were still to be continued, it became necessary to exempt them from the new archbishop's jurisdiction. Accordingly, the Assembly passed an act "ordaining the superintendent of Fife to use his own jurisdiction, as before, in those provinces not subject to the archbishop of St. Andrews; and requesting him to concur with the said archbishop in his visitations, or otherwise when he required him, until the next Assembly. And in like manner, the superintendents of Angus and Lothian, without prejudice of the said archbishop, except by virtue of his commission[3]."

On the 6th of August another Assembly met at Perth, when the superintendents of Angus and Fife, with several others, were appointed a committee, "to consider the heads and articles concluded at Leith, January last by past, and what they find therein either to be retained or altered, to report it again to the Assembly; and ordain all and sundry brethren that have any reasons to allege against the said conclusions, to convene with the foresaid brethren the said day, or before, and shew their opinions, with certification that they shall not be heard after[4]." There was such a wholesome terror

[1] Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, p. 197.
[2] Calderwood, 55.
[3] Petrie, 375, cited in Fund. Ch. 203.
[4] Calderwood, 57.

of popery on the minds of the protestants of that time, that they were apprehensive that to give the same offices the ancient names would infallibly produce popery; and lest a change of name should produce a change of religion, they objected to altering the title of superintendents into that of archbishops and bishops. Although they cheerfully continued under the titular Episcopal government, yet they preferred the title of superintendent to that of bishop, lest, "by using any such names, they should ratify, or consent and agree, to any kind of papistry or superstition;" and therefore they protested against any change of the *titles*, till the prince should come of age. The committee reported to the Assembly, and the following act, grounded on their report, was framed:—

"Forsamickle as in the *Assembly*, holden in Leith in January last, certain commissioners were appointed to travel with the nobility and their commissioners, to reason and conclude upon divers articles and heads then thought good to be conferred upon; according to which commission they proceeded at divers diets and conventions, and finally agreed, for that time, upon the said heads and articles, as the same produced in this Assembly proports, in which, being considered and read, are found certain names, such as archbishop, dean, archdeacon, chancellor, chapter; which *names* are thought scandalous and offensive to the ears of many of the brethren, appearing to *sound* to papistry: Therefore the whole Assembly, mone voice, as well those that were in commission at Leith, as others, solemnly protest that they mean not by using any such names to ratify or consent and agree to any kind of papistry or superstition, and wish rather the *names* to be changed into *other names* that are not scandalous and offensive. And in like manner, protest that the said heads and articles agreed upon be only received as an interim, till farther and more perfect order may be obtained at the hands of the king's majesty's regent and nobility, for the which they will press, as occasion shall serve: unto the which protestation the whole Assembly convened, in one voice adhered[1]."

In this act, the Assembly at Leith, which restored the ancient *names*, is recognised as a lawful and free Assembly, and episcopacy is also acknowledged; for they do not protest against the *system*, but the *name*, as savouring of "papistrie," against which they had a feverish apprehension. It was declared, that by using the ancient titles they did not mean to restore the popish superstition; but it was agreed that the name of

[1] Calderwood, 58.

bishop should be used for archbishop; the chapter be called the bishop's assembly, the dean to be called the moderator of the assembly, and a report was ordered to be made, suggesting what names might be substituted for archdeacon, chancellor, abbot, and prior; but Spottiswood says that no such report was ever made. This, says Heylin, "brings into my mind the fancy of some people in the deserts of Africa, who, having been terribly wasted with *tigers*, and not able otherwise to destroy them, passed a decree that none should thenceforth *call them tigers;* and then all was well!"[1]

This Assembly recognised and approved of the appointment of Douglas to the see of St. Andrews, James Boyd to the archbishopric of Glasgow, James Paton to the bishopric of Dunkeld, and Andrew Graham to the bishopric of Dunblane. Ecclesiastical affairs were now beginning to wear a more regular aspect, and order to succeed the confusion which had hitherto reigned. Bishop Russell cites part of a letter from Knox to the Assembly, in which he approves of the late arrangement, and "requests that his brethren would enact that all bishopries vacant may be presented, and qualified persons nominated thereunto, within a year after the vaking thereof, *according to the order taken in Leith, by the commissioners of the nobility and of the kirk, in the month of January last*[2]." Knox suggests also that an act be made "decreeing and ordaining all bishops, admitted by the order of the kirk *now received*, to give an account of their whole rents and intromissions therewith once in the year[2]." And in furtherance of the regent's good intentions, the second parliament of James VI. cap. 35, passed an act for the "ratification of the freedom of the true Kirk of God," at Stirling, 28th August,—"Item, Our sovereign lord, with advice and consent of his said regent, the three estates, and haill body of this present parliament, has ratified, and by this present acte ratifies and approves, all and quhatsomever actes and statutes made of befoir by our soveraine lord, or his predecessoures, anent the freedom and liberty of the trew Kirk of God and religion, now publicly professed within this realme[3]."

In the month of October, the earl of Marr, the regent, died, his end having been hastened by the confusion and miscarriages of his regency. He was allowed by both parties to have been a good, well-intentioned man; but Morton exercised such an influence over him that he engrossed the whole

[1] Heylin, lib. v. 180-1.—Spottiswood, b. v. 260.—Calderwood, 58.
[2] Hist. of Ch. in Scotland, &c. i. 332. [3] Stevenson's Coll. 13.

power and patronage, and the earl of Mar merely enjoyed the empty name of regent. On the first of November, Morton was elected to the regency, which had all along been the grand object of his guilty ambition, and he was more thoroughly the abject creature of Elizabeth than either of the preceding regents. The contentions between the successful rebels, who governed in the name of the infant prince, and the devoted adherents of the illustrious but unfortunate queen Mary, produced on both sides the most horrible barbarities and acts of tyranny on the defenceless people. The castle of Edinburgh was held for the queen by Kirkaldy of Grange, and Leith was garrisoned by the earl of Morton in the name of the prince; and both parties sent out detachments to harass and oppress the inoffensive inhabitants of the neighbourhood. On one occasion, Morton burnt all the corn mills near Edinburgh, and placing troops in ambush in all the approaches to the city, he intercepted the farmers going to market with provisions, two of whom he hanged, and branded all the others on the cheek. He also seized five women going to market, whose sex was no protection, one of whom he drowned, the others he ordered to be whipped, and branded on the top of the thigh. These barbarities were not confined to one side; for Kirkaldy also made the most cruel and revolting reprisals. Whoever was caught carrying provisions to the prince's party at Leith were hanged where caught; and Kirkaldy had a diabolical pleasure in playing the artillery of the Castle on the innocent and defenceless inhabitants of the city; so that for some time these barbarous cruelties were mutually kept up, no man being spared by either party, whatever was his rank, or howsoever he was taken[1].

Some days of fasting and humiliation were ordered to be observed on account of the most diabolical massacre of the protestants in France, which filled the whole kingdom with terror and dismay. Solemn thanks were offered up at Rome for this inhuman outrage on christian feelings and duties, and medals were cast by order of the pope to perpetuate its memory. "It inflicted a deep wound on the exhausted spirit of Knox. Besides the blow struck at the reformed body, he had to lament the loss of many individuals eminent for piety, learning, and rank, whom he numbered among his acquaintance. Being conveyed to the pulpit, and summoning up the remainder of his strength, he thundered the vengeance of heaven against 'the cruel murderer and false traitor, the king of France,' and

[1] Crawford, Mem. 215.

desired Le Croc, the French ambassador, to tell his master that sentence was pronounced against him in Scotland, that the divine vengeance would never depart from him nor from his house, if repentance did not ensue; but his name would remain an execration to posterity, and none proceeding from his loins should enjoy his kingdom in peace. The ambassador complained of the indignity offered to his master, and required the regent to silence the preacher; but this was refused, upon which he left Scotland[1]."

On the 24th November, John Knox departed this life. He was an eminent instrument in the hand of God in reclaiming the nation from the errors of popery; but had he meddled less with secular affairs, and paid more obedience to his sovereign, he would have left a more exalted monument of piety behind him. Unhappily for his sovereign and his country, he constantly advocated the cause of rebellion, and encouraged resistance to lawful authority. He refused even to pray for the queen, and by the force of his example and influence he prevented others from praying for her, "as being utterly unworthy of such a benefit;" in consequence, he has left such a sting behind him as has deluged these kingdoms with blood, and plunged them into anarchy and rebellion, and an evil spirit of democratical turbulence, which extinguished the church of the three kingdoms and the monarchy in a deluge of blood and fire. The doctrines, unhappily, which he taught, and by his influence which the protestant ministers generally taught from the pulpit, were, that it belonged to the rabble to reform religion publicly, and by force,—to reform the state, if it would not reform the church,—to extirpate all false religion by their own authority,—to assume to themselves a power to overturn the powers that are ordained of God,—to depose them, and set up new powers in their stead; for which, see Knox's Appellation, where these doctrines are gravely taught. Knox and his coadjutors also taught, that the doctrine of defensive arms was necessary,—that passive obedience, or non-resistance, was sinful, when people have the means of resistance, which exactly corresponds with the doctrine of the Jesuits; and that Daniel and his fellows did not resist by the sword, because God had not given them the power and the means. He taught, moreover, contrary to truth and fact, that the primitive Christians assisted their preachers even against their rulers and magistrates, and suppressed idolatry, wheresoever God placed the forcible means within their power; and that it is lawful for

[1] M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 336-7.

private men to punish idolaters with death, if by any means God gives them power. He maintained, that the judicial laws of Moses continued still obligatory, particularly that the laws punishing adultery, murder, and idolatry, with death, were still binding; that in obedience to these laws, sentence was to be executed, not only on subjects, but on sovereign princes; that whosoever executes God's law on such criminals is not only innocent, but within the limits of his duty, though he have no commission from man for it; that Samuel's slaying Agag, the fat and delicate king of Amalek, and Elias killing Baal's priests and Jezabel's false prophets, and Phineas striking Zimri and Cozbi, in the very act of filthy fornication, were allowable practices for private men to imitate.

A standing text with Knox, and indeed with all the immediate disciples of Calvin, was that injunction mentioned in 13th Deut. against participating in the idolatry of the Gentile nations. "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, &c. thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him, neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare him, neither shalt thou conceal him, but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death. Thou shalt stone him with stones that he die," &c. "Such, therefore," says Knox, "as solicit to idolatry (popery), ought to be punished with death, without favour or respect of persons. The punishment of such crimes as are idolatry, blasphemy, and others that touch the majesty of God, doth not pertain to kings or chief rulers only, but to the whole body of the people, and to every member of the same, according to the vocation of every man, and according to that possibility and occasion which God doth minister to revenge the injury done against his glory." "To the same law, I say, and covenant, are the Gentiles no less bound than were the Jews, whensoever God doth illuminate the eyes of any multitude of people, and putteth the sword in their own hand to remove such enormities from amongst them as before God they know to be abominable[1]. These doctrines are to be found and are maintained in the notes on an edition of the Romish Testament, published in Ireland in the year 1816, under the sanction and patronage of the Romish bishops there, and their principal clergy.

Knox gave utterance to prayers which did not savour of a

[1] Appen. to Keith's Catalogue of Scottish Bishops, p. 486-7.

christian or a charitable spirit. In his "Admonition to the Professors of the Truth in England," after descanting on the Marian persecution, he has this prayer:—"God of his great mercy's sake stir up some Phineas, Elias, or Jehu, that the blood of abominable idolaters may pacify God's wrath, that it consume not the whole multitude—amen;" which is surely a direct incentive to murder. And again he prays—"Repress the pride of these blood-thirsty tyrants; consume them in thine anger, according to the reproach which they have brought against thy holy name. Pour forth thy vengeance upon them, and let our eyes behold the blood of the saints required at their hands. Delay not thy vengeance, O Lord; but let death devour them in haste; let the earth swallow them up, and let them go down quick (alive) to the hells; for there is no hope of their amendment; the fear and reverence of thy holy name is quite banished from their hearts, and therefore yet again, O Lord, consume them; consume them in thine anger." The man who could utter such prayers to the Father of Mercies must have been actuated by another spirit than that which ought to inflame the heart with divine love, and subdue the wrathful disposition to meekness and fear. In short, he seems to have been governed by that implacable thirst of revenge which was the ruling principle of the fierce and lawless spirits of the age and country in which he lived. How great the contrast, how immeasurable the distance, between such prayers and those of the Anglican liturgy compiled by his contemporaries the great purifiers of the English church!

John Knox certainly did not institute the presbyterian discipline which holds equality among the ministers as a fundamental principle; he introduced an episcopacy on the ruins of the ancient church, in which superintendents, which is only another name for bishops, enjoyed that pre-eminence and jurisdiction which is the just prerogative of lawful bishops. In another place[1], thirty marks, both in their institution and subsequent usage, have been given, which prove that they both possessed and exercised episcopal power and pre-eminence over the parish ministers. And his practice was every way consistent with his doctrine; for he presided at the admission, or ordination, of John Spottiswood to be superintendent or bishop of Lothian, and also preached the sermon on that occasion; he inaugurated ten of the superintendents, and he assisted the titular bishop of Orkney, and two superintendents, to crown the duke of Rothsay as king; and also preached on

[1] Ante, c. v.

that occasion. Had he been so thoroughly imbued with anti-episcopal principles as his pretended followers wish to ascribe to him, he would not have joined in these acts, far less have suffered a titular bishop to have taken precedence of himself and crowned the infant prince. Farther, he preached at the admission of archbishop Douglas, which is the clearest evidence that he approved of his being appointed to that office. He very justly protested against Douglas continuing to possess so many offices, but never once against *the office of a bishop*. He sent his sons to the episcopal university of Cambridge, to prosecute their studies, and of course to become members of that church in which he himself had held a living, and in which he also informs us that he was offered a bishopric. His latest biographer, the late Dr. M'Crie, who would have been the last man to have admitted the least predilection in his hero towards episcopacy, had it not been extorted from him by facts, honestly states—"Our reformer left behind him a widow and five children. His two sons were borne to him by his first wife, Margery Bowes . . . . . They received their education at St. John's College in the University of Cambridge: their names being enrolled in the matriculation-book only eight days after the death of their father. Nathanael, the eldest of them, after obtaining the degrees of bachelor and master of arts, and being admitted fellow of the college, died in 1580. Eleazer, the youngest son, in addition to the honours attained by his brother, was created bachelor of divinity, *ordained* one of the preachers of the University, and *admitted* to the vicarage of Clacton-Magna. He died in 1591, and was buried in the chapel of St. John's College[1]." And the writer of this has heard the late venerable primate Walker say that he must have walked over his grave daily while pursuing his studies at the same college.

Knox recommended to king Edward VI. to increase the number of bishops. "Let no man be charged," said he, "in preaching of Christ Jesus above that a man may do: I mean, that your bishoprics be so divided, that of every one (as they are now for the most part) may be made ten; and so in every city and great town there may be placed a godly learned man, with so many joined with him, for preaching and instruction, as shall be thought sufficient for the bounds committed to their charge." These are Knox's own words, which, connected with his constant practice, is a decided and incontrovertible testimony that he was in principle and practice an episco-

[1] M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 368.

palian, and that he held the principles of the Catholic Church. It is well known that he had the principal hand in compiling the First Book of Discipline, where episcopacy is most decidedly established; the names only of offices are changed, lest, as the act of Assembly of this same year bears, "by using the *same names* they might seem to consent to any papistry or superstition." He was the writer and bearer also of a letter from the superintendents, ministers, and commissioners of the church within the realm of Scotland, to their brethren, the bishops and pastors in England, in the year 1566; and in the title of that epistle he acknowledged that these brethren, the bishops and pastors of England, had renounced the Roman antichrist, and professed the Lord Jesus in sincerity. The letter itself unquestionably allows and presupposes the episcopal power to be possessed by his brethren, the English bishops. His "Faithful admonition to the true professors of the gospel of Christ within the kingdom of England," anno 1554, was written for the purpose of enumerating the causes which brought the Marian persecution on that church and nation; but among all the causes which he enumerates, he never once names episcopacy as one—an omission which he never would have made had he entertained the opinion "that prelacy, and the superiority of any office in the church, above presbyters, had been *a great and insupportable grievance and trouble* to the nation," as the claim of right alleges, or a "*crimson guilt*," as the General Assembly of 1690 asserts, or "the *establishment of iniquity* by law," as the Assembly of 1703 alleges. In that same admonition, he says, "God gave such strength to that *reverend father in God, Thomas Cranmer*, to cut the knots of devilish sophistry, &c." If he had held the opinion that parity among ministers was the true and only principle of church government, it is not likely that he would have called an archbishop a reverend father in God, which is the peculiar title of a bishop. No one has been bold enough to dispute the fact, that superintendents were placed in the government of the reformed communion by John Knox; and that this government of superintendents was in operation in the year 1566, is undeniable. We are informed that he wrote the fourth book of his history that year; and in the introduction to it, he says, "We can speak the truth, whomsoever we offend—there is no realm that hath the sacraments in like purity; for all others, how sincere that ever the doctrine be, that by some is taught,—retain in their churches, and in the ministers thereof, some footsteps of antichrist and dregs of popery. But we (all praise to God alone) *have nothing within our church that ever*

flowed from that man of sin." Now, his titular episcopacy certainly "was within his church;" which, had he either esteemed it unlawful, "a footstep of antichrist, or a dreg of popery," he could not have made the bold assertion above quoted; or else he surely would have excepted superintendency, as savouring of the beast, or, as he says, "flowing from that man of sin." But, so far from that, he asserts *the purity and anti-popish* establishment of his superintendents. He was himself a "commissioner for visitation," as they were then called—that is, a temporary superintendent or bishop, for Calderwood asserts that a superintendent and a commissioner is the same office; and, in consequence, he acted in a degree of superiority over his brethren, the ministers within the bounds of his commission; and he sat, voted, and concurred with many General Assemblies, when they framed acts which enforced the canonical obedience of ministers to their superintendents[1]. In summing up his character, Spottiswood says, "he was certainly a man endowed with rare gifts, and a chief instrument that God used for the work of those times. Many good men have disliked some of his opinions as touching sovereign princes, and the form of government which he laboured to have established in the church. Yet was he far from those dotages wherein some that would have been thought his followers did afterwards fall; for never was any man more observant of church authority than he, always *urging* the *obedience* of *ministers* to their *superintendents*, for which he caused divers acts to be made in the Assemblies of the church, and showed himself severe to the transgressors. In these things, howsoever it may be he was miscarried, we must remember that the best men have their errors, and never esteem of any man above that which is fitting. As to the history of the church ascribed commonly unto him, the same was not his work, but his name was supposed to gain it credit: for, besides the scurril discourses we find in it, more befitting a comedian on a stage than a divine or minister, such as Mr. Knox was, and the *spiteful malice* that author expresseth against the queen regent, speaking of one of our martyrs, he remitted the reader for a farther declaration of his sufferings to the acts and monuments of martyrs set forth by Mr. Fox, an Englishman, which came not to light some ten or twelve years after Mr. Knox his death. A greater injury could not be done to the fame of that *worthy man*, than to father upon him the ridiculous toys and malicious detractions contained in that book. But this shall serve for

[1] Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, p. 28—37.

his clearing in that particular. He died the 27th November, in the 67th year of his age, and his body was interred in the church-yard of St. Giles's[1]."

I should not have occupied so much time with Knox's opinions, were it not that so great pains have been taken to make it appear that, in sentiments and practice, he was a rigid presbyterian, the determined opponent of episcopacy and of all liturgical forms of public worship; whereas, in reality, he was the author of an unconsecrated episcopacy, or superintendency; he was also the chief agent in introducing the Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI., and afterwards the old Scottish or Knox's liturgy, into the public worship of the (titular) Church of Scotland. But, after all, why should so much deference be paid to the opinions of an uninspired and not too scrupulously moral man? We have Moses and the prophets, and Christ with the apostles, to be lamps unto our feet and lights unto our paths; and no "devout imagination" of Knox or of any other man ought to divert us in thought or deed from the doctrine and fellowship of the apostles. But the presbyterians, who unhappily have gone in the way of Cain, and have run greedily after the error of Balaam, and have run the risk of perishing in the gainsaying of Korah, hold Knox's person in admiration, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities. Christ gave a commission to his apostles, with whom he promised to be to the end of the world, which implies an apostolical succession; but Knox *cut off* that succession, and *without any new divine commission* he established a new succession, which had no other authority but his own "devout imagination." From a natural mistake arising out of the circumstance that four of the Roman bishops embraced the reformation, Mr. Palmer has taken the most charitable view of the Knoxian church, and says, that after the Concordat of Leith, "thenceforward the dioceses of Scotland were filled by bishops who were *consecrated* by other prelates, and sat in parliament[2]." Now this is a judgment in charity, but not in truth; for in point of fact, of these four bishops, only one of them, Galloway, *might* really have been consecrated; the other three were mere laymen, and the bishop of Galloway never officiated at the inauguration of the other titular bishops; nay, he himself was of new inaugurated by Knox, that is, ordained to be superintendent of his own diocese of Galloway. And Mr. Palmer adds, still in the spirit of charity, "such being in general the posi-

[1] Spottiswood's Hist. b. v. p. 266-7.
[2] Treatise of the Church of Christ, v. ii. p. 572-3.

tion of the church of Scotland up to the accession of James VI. to the throne of England, there seemed *no reason to dispute* its character as a church of Christ." But with respectful deference for Mr. Palmer's judgment in this case, we must beg leave to dispute the title of the Knoxian kirk to the character of a church of Christ; because most of those who were made bishops, and three of the papal prelates that conformed, had no orders at all. Their receiving a public and legislative sanction, sitting in parliament, and being *called* bishops, could never constitute them successors of the apostles, nor remove the reproach of their having run unsent—of their having climbed up some other way, and of their not having entered into the sheepfold by the door—in short, of their not having been called, "as was Aaron," to the apostolic office.

About the end of this year the regent summoned a parliament to meet at Edinburgh, when several acts were made for the preservation of the king's authority and the established religion, in one of which it was enacted, that "none should be reputed loyal and faithful subjects to the king or his authority, but be punished as rebels, who made not profession of true religion. And that all such as made profession thereof and yet withstood the king's authority, should be admonished by their teachers to acknowledge their offence, and return to his majesty's obedience; and if they refused that they should be excommunicated, and cut off from the society of the church as putrid and corrupted members[1]."

1573.—Morton, by command of Elizabeth, whom she supplied with a body of troops, vigorously attacked Kirkaldy in the castle, and soon reduced him to terms; and on the solemn assurance of the English ambassador, that his queen would interfere to preserve his life, he surrendered to Morton's summons. Elizabeth, however, ordered the regent to sacrifice Kirkaldy for their mutual safety; he was hanged accordingly, and his head was placed on the castle wall[2]. Sir William Kirkaldy of Grange was equally celebrated for his courage in the field and his wisdom in the cabinet. He served in the French army with great honour, as a cavalry officer; and he conquered the earl of Rivers' brother in single combat, in presence of the Scottish and English armies. It was commonly said of him, that he had all the tenderness and address of a lover in the house, and the fury of a lion in the field. But he was one of Cardinal Beaton's murderers, in the year 1545; he

[1] Spottiswood, b. v. p. 268.
[2] Crawford's Memoirs.—Balfour's Annals, i. p. 361.

was engaged in Moray's rebellion, in 1564, on account of the queen's marriage with lord Darnley; he was again engaged in the rebellion of 1567, when he treacherously decoyed his confiding sovereign into the hands of her implacable enemies, at Carberry Hill; in 1569 he deserted his old associate and fellow rebel, the earl of Moray, who had entrusted him with the government of the castle; and in 1570 he murdered Henry Seaton, and lost the confidence of the whole party, by protecting the assassin whom he had employed. He was strongly suspected of having procured a vile assassin to attempt the murder of John Knox, while he was quietly engaged at supper in his own house. The mortal enmity that subsisted between him and Morton was the only motive that fixed him to the queen's interest; so that the honour of suffering for his loyalty cannot be ascribed to him. No sooner was that other execrable traitor, Maitland of Lethington, informed of the ignominious fate of Kirkaldy, than he swallowed poison, to escape the disgrace of a public execution, and to disappoint Morton of that revenge for which he thirsted. Maitland betrayed his queen, who implicitly trusted to him; and forged her handwriting, to serve the rebels by whom she was surrounded during the whole of her actual reign. He also forged the whole of the sonnets and billets to Bothwell, which were made the plea for all her persecution by her enemies; and which he acknowledged to Elizabeth's commissioners at York.

The first Assembly for this year was held in Edinburgh, the 6th of March, when David Ferguson was chosen moderator, and Calderwood is delighted to find that that occasional dignitary was neither bishop nor superintendent; and also that the bishop of Galloway was superseded by the Assembly, till time was gained to inquire into some alleged malversation in office[1]. On this occurrence, bishop Sage makes the following caustic remarks:—"There is another considerable thrust made at it" (the titular episcopacy) "by Calderwood, which may come in as a succedaneum to the former argument. What is it? It is even that in the General Assembly at Edinburgh, March 6, 1573, David Ferguson was chosen moderator, who was neither bishop nor superintendent. And so down falls prelacy! But so was honest George Buchanan in the Assembly holden in July 1567, who was neither superintendent, bishop, nor *presbyter*, and so down falls presbytery! nay, down falls the whole ministry! Is not this a hard lock prelacy is brought to, that it shall not be itself so long as one wrong

[1] Calderwood, p. 61.

step can be found to have been made by a Scotch General Assembly[1]?"

"The regent craved some learned men of the ministers to be placed senators of the College of Justice;" and after some discussion, the Assembly decided, "that none was able to bear the said two charges; and therefore inhibited any minister to take upon him to be a senator of the College of Justice, Mr. Robert Pont only excepted, who was already placed with advice and consent of the kirk." In this decision of the General Assembly, the Leith Assembly, that restored the name of the bishops, is clearly asserted, and its validity placed beyond doubt or dispute, for it was "by the advice and consent of the kirk" collected in the Leith Assembly, that Pont was appointed a judge, and whose functions he continued to exercise even after presbytery was introduced. The reader of Dalry was censured by the General Assembly, on the complaint of David Lindsay, commissioner for Kyle and Cunningham, "for that being discharged of all ministration of the Lord's Supper, he, notwithstanding, ministered the same, after his manner, at *Easter*[2]." This is another manifestation that the festivals of the church were duly celebrated; and in conformity with the pious custom of the universal church, the Lord's Supper was administered at the festivals.

In the Assembly held 6th of August this year, Alexander Arbuthnot moderator, "the visitation books of the bishops were produced, and certain ministers were appointed to examine their diligence in visitation." Paton, bishop of Dunkeld, was accused of having assumed the name, without having exercised the office of a bishop, and for not having proceeded with rigour against the Roman Catholics within his diocese. Herein we have a clear acknowledgment of episcopacy; for the accusation rested on his having asumed the name without having performed the duties of a bishop. This Assembly established several branches of true episcopal power, in the persons of these titular bishops, which has been entirely omitted by Calderwood, as inconsistent with his presbyterian prepossessions, but Petrie has given the substance of the acts. "Touching them that receive excommunicates, the whole kirk presently assembled, ordains all *bishops*, &c. to proceed to excommunication against all receivers of excommunicated persons," &c. "The kirk ordains all *bishops*, &c. in their synodal conventions, to take a list of the names of the excommunicates within their jurisdiction, and bring them to the General Assemblies, to be published to other

[1] Fundamental Charter, p. 200. [2] Calderwood, p. 4.

bishops and superintendents, &c. that they by their ministers in their provinces may devulgate the same in the whole countries where excommunicates haunt." "The kirk presently assembled, ordains *all bishops and superintendents*, &c. to convene before them all such persons as shall be found suspected of consulting with witches, and finding them guilty, to cause them to make public repentance," &c. "That uniformity may be observed in processes of excommunication, it is ordained, that *bishops and superintendents* shall direct their letters to ministers, where the persons that are to be excommunicated dwell, commanding the said ministers to admonish accordingly; and in case of disobedience to proceed to excommunication, and pronounce the sentence thereof; and thereafter the ministers to indorse the said letters, making mention of the days of their admonitions and excommunications for disobedience aforesaid, and *to report to the said bishops*, &c. according to the direction contained in the said letters[1]." In the above acts of this Assembly, we have thus the clearest demonstration that the titular bishops exercised episcopal powers, and were cheerfully acknowledged by the whole kirk. In proof of this, the Assembly passed acts confirming their ordinary powers, and enjoining due submission to their authority by the parish ministers.

In this Assembly complaints were made against Pont, superintendent of Moray, for non-residence in his diocese, and neglect of his episcopal duties. He pleaded want of leisure on account of his more pressing duties as a judge of the court of session. Gordon, bishop or superintendent of Galloway, was accused of having exhorted the people to rebel against the king, and of refusing to pray for him during the time that the queen's friends held possession of the capital; of having violated his oath of allegiance, especially by sitting in the queen's parliament; that, being one of the queen's pretended privy council, he publicly in the pulpit gave thanks to God for the murder of the regent Lennox, exhorted the people to do the same, and threatened a similar fate to others." Sundry other enormities were laid to his charge; but he pleaded the benefit of the Act of Pacification at the conclusion of the civil war, to which Act the reformed bishops, abbots, and priors, agreed in parliament in name of the kirk, and therefore he maintained he could not now be challenged by another authority. The Assembly sent a messenger to ascertain the regent and council's will, and to ask their advice; who replied, that his

[1] MS. and Petrie, cited in Fundamental Charter of Presbytery.

grace would observe the heads of the pacification, but without prejudice to the discipline of the kirk, and the satisfaction required for all notorious and open slanders. The Assembly acted upon the regent's hint, and again summoned the bishop to appear, but which he again declined to do, having sent the above defence by a servant. The bishop's offences having been notorious, and, indeed, not denied by himself, the Assembly adjudged him to make public repentance in sackcloth on three successive Sundays—the first in St. Giles' Church, the second in the Chapel Royal, and the third in the Queen's College. Two of the brethren were appointed to admonish him in the Assembly's name, and to require him to perform his penance under pain of excommunication[1].

1574.—The convocation of two Assemblies annually must have been very detrimental to the morality and spiritual interests of the different parishes, from the frequent absence of the ministers, and the great length of time they occupied in travelling to the place of meeting. The spring Assembly of this year commenced its sittings on the 6th of March, when, among other things, James Boyd, archbishop of Glasgow, the superintendents of Angus and Strathearn, with several inferior ministers, were appointed a committee to draw up some heads and articles concerning the jurisdiction of the kirk; and the same individuals afterwards received full powers from the Assembly to negociate the same with the regent and privy council, "tending to the setting forward of the glory of God, maintaining the preaching of his word, the king's authority, and common weal of the realm, firm and stable." The Assembly enacted, "touching the jurisdiction of bishops in their ecclesiastical function, that it should not exceed the jurisdiction of superintendents, which heretofore they have had, and at present possess; and that they should be subject to the General Assembly as members thereof, as superintendents had been heretofore, in all sorts." And ordained, "that no bishop give collation of any benefice within the bounds of superintendents, without their consent and testimonials under their hand; and that bishops within their dioceses visit by themselves, where no superintendent is, and give no collation of benefices without the consent of three well qualified ministers[2]."

In these regulations there were no other limitations to the powers of the bishops than there are in every church; that is, that the bishops were bound by the canons made in a lawful assembly of the national church; but the true motive for these

[1] Calderwood's True History, p. 63.

[2] Ibid.

acts was the insatiable covetousness of Morton the regent, who having secured a profound peace at home, employed every art to amass wealth. "He fleeced the nation," says Crawford, "of more money than any seven kings had ever done before him, which he entirely appropriated to his own private use, having reduced the prince's establishment to a very small number, and to a smaller allowance." He flattered and cajoled the ministers out of the possession of their *thirds* of the benefices—the only provision that had been made for them by law since the reformation; promising them instead, that he would settle stipends, to be regularly paid out of the Exchequer. But no sooner had he secured possession of the thirds than he united three or four parishes under one incumbent, whom he compelled to preach in each alternately; and in each parish he placed a reader, whose duty was to read the prayers on those Sundays when the minister was absent, whom he compelled to allow about thirty pounds Scots, or three pounds sterling, per annum, out of his own miserable pittance; and the whole revenues of the parishes thus united, he sacrilegiously seized on as his own property. Had a lawful sovereign been guilty of such hypocritical villainy and spoliation, his name would have been handed down to posterity with the execration it deserved; but, as Morton rendered good service a short time after this to the new system which commenced its existence in the following year, his infamous treachery and idolatrical covetousness have been duly concealed by the successful party. The misery of the harassed, oppressed, and starved ministers was greatly increased by their being compelled to dance attendance on the regent's court, "begging assignations and precepts for payments, as their necessities grew; seeking for augmentation, which they seldom obtained, or if any petty thing was granted, the same was dearly bought, with the loss both of their time and means." Besides, the superintendents, who were, as Dr. Cook calls them, "the fathers of the reformation," and were men of the highest reputation, who had spent their own private estates liberally in the service of the church, were treated by Morton with scorn and contempt; for on application for their usual allowance, which had been fixed at five times that of the parish ministers, they were sneeringly informed, that there was no further occasion for their services, since the bishops had been restored. It was natural for the superintendents to resent such insults; and, accordingly, at the autumn Assembly, which met in Edinburgh on the 7th of August, the three remaining superintendents, Spottiswood, Winram, and Erskine, offered to resign their charges, but the Assembly unanimously

refused to accept their resignation, well knowing the cause. The members had an association of feeling with these venerable fathers, not knowing how soon the next Mortonian experiment might be tried on themselves. The Assembly, therefore, renewed that article of the Leith concordat, "That bishops and superintendents *stood on the same level*, had the same power, the same ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and were to be regulated by the same canons." And farther, they drew up a petition, consisting of nine articles, to the regent, some of which severely reflected on his sacrilegious covetousness:—"That stipends be granted to superintendents *in all time coming*, in all countries destitute thereof, whether it be where there is no bishop, or where there are bishops who cannot discharge their office, as the bishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow," whose dioceses were much too large. It is evident from this act, that episcopacy was not esteemed any burden; for the Assembly not only protected those superintendents who had survived and had borne the heat and burden of the reformation, but they petitioned for additions to their numbers, and for provision for them "*in all time coming*." They evidently supposed that episcopacy was to continue "in all time coming," and not to be esteemed a "devout imagination merely," to serve a temporary purpose. The second article is, "That in all burghs where the ministers are displaced and serve at other kirks, these ministers be restored to wait on their cures, and be not obliged to serve at other churches, &c." This article struck directly at the regent's insidious policy of uniting three or four churches under the care of one minister. The fourth article is, "That in all churches destitute of ministers, such persons may be planted as the bishops, superintendents, and commissioners shall name, and that stipends be assigned to them." The fifth, "That Doctors may be placed in universities, and stipends granted them; whereby not only they who are presently placed may have occasion to be diligent in their cures, but other learned men may have occasion to seek places in colleges." The sixth, "That his grace would take a general order with the poor, especially in the abbeys, such as Aberbrothick, &c. conform to the agreement at Leith." The ninth, "That his grace would cause the books of the assignation of the kirk to be delivered to the clerk of the Assembly." These were the books wherein the names of the ministers and their several proportions of the *thirds* were recorded, which shews their eagerness to be re-possessed of the thirds because the regent had not kept faith with them.

"But," says bishop Sage, "the eighth article, which (by a pardonable inversion, I hope,) I have reserved to the last place, is, of all, the most considerable. It is, 'That his grace *would provide qualified persons for vacant bishoprics.*' Let the candid reader judge now if episcopacy by the Leith articles was *forced* upon the church *against* her inclination? If it was never approven (when bishops were thus petitioned for) by a General Assembly? If it be likely that the Assembly in August, 1572, protested against it as a corruption? If the acts of the last Assembly declaring bishops to have no more power than superintendents had, and making them accountable to the General Assembly, proceeded from any dislike of episcopacy? If this Assembly, petitioning thus for bishops, believed the divine and indispensable institution of parity? If both Calderwood and Petrie acted not as became *cautious* presbyterian historians; the one by giving us none, the other by giving us only a minced account of this petition?[1]"

The ministers began now to see their error in having allowed Morton to circumvent them, by taking away their trifling stipends; and therefore they petitioned him to restore them; but it was not so easy to recover their lost treasure. Morton, in turn, began to question the legality of their meeting in assemblies, without having been first summoned by the king's writ; and he also demanded of the deputation, "who gave them power to convocate the king's lieges without his advice who was in authority?" After some intentional delays, the regent replied to their petition, "That seeing the surplus of the *thirds* belonged to the king, it was fitter the regent and council should modify the stipends of ministers, than that the church should have the appointment or designation of a surplus." Being unable to contend effectually with the regent, it was determined that the ministers whom he had appointed to pluralities should take charge of the church only where they resided, and send readers to preach at the others. To counteract Morton's insidious policy, it was also found necessary to prohibit the bishops from trespassing on the authority and jurisdiction of the superintendents[2].

It appears clearly from the foregoing acts, *since* the Leith Assembly, which restored the name of bishops, that the Concordat then entered into was fully, fairly, and repeatedly acknowledged, approved of, and insisted on, by the solemn acts

[1] Fundamental Charter of Presbytery examined, p. 212-216.
[2] Spottiswood, b. v. 273.—Calderwood, p. 66.

of several grand national councils of the church. "And after the most impartial, narrow, and attentive search," says Sage, "that I could make, I have not found all this while, viz. from the first public establishment of the reformed religion in Scotland, anno 1560, so much as one indication of either public or private dislike to prelacy: but that it constantly and uninterruptedly prevailed, and all persons cheerfully, as well as quietly, submitted to it, till the year 1575, when it was first called in question." Whatever were the views or sentiments of our early reformers, it is incontrovertible that they were sincerely attached to episcopacy, as the divinely instituted government of the church; and that they were firmly opposed to the scheme of "equality among ministers," which, as Calvin very justly observed, "*breedeth strifes*," as the future history of that church will abundantly testify. No such principle as the "unlawfulness of any superiority of any office in the church above presbyters," was either professed or insisted on, or proposed to be reduced to practice, before, at, or for full fifteen years after the public establishment of the reformation[1].

We have now arrived at an epoch in the ecclesiastical history of Scotland, when a new system and a still more devout imagination was introduced, which maintained a fierce hostility to that "modified and excellent form of episcopacy," as Dr. Cook calls it, "which had been founded by John Knox." Episcopacy was recognised by the agreement at Leith, as the lawful government of the establishment; and in the following Assembly, in March of the same year, Douglas, the new archbishop of St. Andrews, was appointed one of a committee for revising the articles of the Leith agreement. The following Assembly at Perth, still recognising the Leith concordat, only stipulated for a change of the names of the offices, lest the names should indicate an inclination to popery. Presbyterian authors object, that the agreement at Leith was only received as an INTERIM; but its being so received was not out of any dislike or opposition to episcopacy; for if they had believed and maintained the divine right of presbytery, they would surely never have admitted of prelacy even as an interim, nor would they have petitioned, as they did, for more bishops. The acts of almost every Assembly recognised the episcopacy of the superintendents, and the Leith agreement approved of their continuance under the ancient titles of bishops and archbishops;

[1] Fund. Ch. of Presb. 203, &c.—Crawford.—Spottiswood.—Calderwood.

but it neither revived nor introduced it. Up to the period of Knox's death, the presbyterian controversy had not been heard of in the kingdom, and he left all the bishoprics in the kingdom filled, although, unfortunately, they had no canonical orders or consecration to the apostolic office, but were mere laymen. This arose from his having despised and set aside the ancient and scriptural rite of the laying on of hands, out of hatred to popery, and of his stern rejection of such of the bishops of the papal church as really had been canonically consecrated to the episcopal office, and therefore could have continued it in the reformed church. It was an unusual and presumptuous feature, too, in the Knoxian communion, that the parochial ministers, when they met in assembly, made themselves judges of their governors the superintendents; a circumstance entirely in opposition to St. Paul's instructions to a bishop, that he should "command and teach;"—the elders "that sin, rebuke before all;"—"rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith." In pursuance of this system of inverting the order of government, we find that the superintendents were put upon their trial in almost every Assembly, rebuked and censured, and some even were compelled to do penance, by the collective body of theinferior ministers.

At the death of Knox, ecclesiastical affairs were in a fair way of producing that state of tranquillity which would have been most beneficial to the nation and to religion. But no sooner was Knox removed from the scene, than another system was introduced, not without the manifest interference of queen Elizabeth and the connivance of the regent Morton, which produced contentions, and brought calamities upon the church and nation such as no other kingdom in christendom has ever experienced. This is even admitted by Dr. Cook, a presbyterian, who, in speaking of Morton, says, "He had promoted the introduction into the church of *a modified and excellent form of episcopacy*; he had done so from the persuasion that he would thereby secure the tranquillity of the nation, by directing to the support of government the strong influence which the ministers had over the minds and principles of the people. He had it now in his power to accomplish an object of such evident and such vast importance. Had he availed himself of this favourable situation to *endow the bishoprics* with suitable revenues, and to extricate the *inferior clergy* from their pecuniary difficulties, he would have completely gained the affections of the reformed teachers; he would have satisfied them that the government, with spotless honour, had

evinced its attachment to the reformation; he would have destroyed every motive for *agitating new plans of ecclesiastical polity;* the principles upon which the episcopal jurisdiction rested would have been rendered daily more acceptable to the community; and there would, in all human probability, have resulted such union and harmony among the different orders of the state, as would have prevented *those dreadful political convulsions*, which, though ultimately most beneficial, *long inflicted the heaviest evils upon the inhabitants of Scotland.*"

CHAPTER VIII.

THE TITULAR PRIMACY OF JOHN DOUGLAS AND PATRICK ADAMSON.

FROM THE FIRST PROPOSAL OF PRESBYTERY TO THE ERECTION OF THE FIRST COURT OF PRESBYTERY.

1575.—First appearance of Andrew Melville—his character by Sage—not in holy orders.—Assembly.—Commissioners appointed to visit the diocese of Glasgow. —Graham bishop elect of Dunblane.—Another Assembly.—The bishop of Dunkeld suspended.—Bishop of Galloway obliged to do penance.—Melville calls the office of a bishop in question, and forms a party.—John Dury's motion in the Assembly—seconded by Melville.—A conference appointed.—The conclusions of the collocutors.—The presbyterian party failed of success.—Culpable indifference of the titular bishops.—A divine institution cannot be changed. —Many apostles mentioned in Scripture besides the twelve.—The proposal of presbytery coldly received.—Petition to the regent.——1576.—Assembly.— Melville renews his assault — again defeated — but gained some advantages. —Message from Morton—his reasons for it.—Queen Elizabeth concerned in the presbyterian plan.—A misunderstanding between Morton and the Assembly.—Patrick Adamson advanced to the see of St. Andrews—contest about his inauguration.—Second Book of Discipline—commission appointed to draw it up—their fitness for it.—Boyd archbishop of Glasgow's spirited conduct—his speech—meetings for exercise.——1577.—An Assembly.—Fast appointed.— Preface to the Second Book, and regent's answer.—Festivals of the church debated.—An Assembly.—Morton's resignation of the regency.—A fast appointed—the causes.——1578.—An Assembly.—Second Book presented to parliament—its preamble—extracts from the Book—remarks.—Beza's Tract. —Parliament reject some of the articles.—Act of Assembly.—A fast.—A second General Assembly.—A third Assembly.—Boyd archbishop of Glasgow attacked — his answer — he is persecuted. — Corruptions in the estate of bishops — their specification. — Attempt to destroy Glasgow cathedral. — Death of archbishop Boyd.—The articles specifying the corruptions in the episcopal estate.——1579.—The queen's messenger refused admittance to her son.—An Assembly.—James's letter to the Assembly.—Archbishop Adamson summoned before the Assembly.—First mention of a presbytery.—Arrival of Esmè Stewart, and his preferment—consequent alarm of the ministers.—Defections to popery.—Duke of Lennox openly renounces popery.—Confession of faith—a parliament—acts for the kirk.——1580.—Assembly.—Act for abolishing titular episcopacy—reflections on it.—Opinions of Chillingworth.— A reformation of Knox's polity—and violent changes.—An Assembly.—No presbyterian government as yet instituted.—Commission to form a presbytery. —The nature, constitution, and powers of a presbytery—inconsistencies in presbyterian courts—reflections—propositions said to have been signed by

archbishop Adamson.——1581.—Negative confession renewed—papal hierarchy condemned—but protestant episcopacy was not condemned by it.—An Assembly—their explanation of the Dundee act.—Montgomery made archbishop of Glasgow—disposes of the revenues to the duke of Lennox.—Montgomery condemned by the Assembly.—James interferes.—The first presbytery erected—uniting of parishes.—Morton beheaded—his character.—Assembly—private baptism prohibited—disputes with Montgomery.—Dury banished the city.—Balcanquhal attacks the duke.—Act for the erection of presbyteries.——1582.—Montgomery suspended.—An Assembly.—Montgomery preaches at Glasgow.—A fast.—Montgomery excommunicated.—The Raid of Ruthven—countenanced by the kirk.—An Assembly—more presbyteries erected.—Death of George Buchanan—his character—his death-bed confession.——1583.—Arrival of ambassadors from France—invited to a grand civic banquet—a fast proclaimed—witch burnt.—James effects his deliverance.——1584.—Opposition of the ministers.—Melville's intrigues.—Parliament.—Earl of Gowry beheaded.—The king's supremacy ratified.—Act made for calling in Buchanan's works.—Alarm of the ministers—their desertion—their letter, and town-council's answer to it.——1585.—Some ministers in their sermons insult the king—he justifies his public conduct,—the clamour of the ministers.—Archbishop Adamson sent ambassador to England.—Measures of self-defence taken by queen Elizabeth.—James summonses a parliament.—Act binding the government to assist Elizabeth.—Death of superintendent Spottiswood—his character.——1586.—A synod at St Andrews.—Archbishop Adamson accused by Melville—his defence—appeals to James—he is excommunicated.—Presbyterian tactics.—A proposal to excommunicate all the episcopal ministers.—James rebukes a minister in the church—his perplexities.—Other transactions.—Advantages gained by James.——1587.—Queen Mary's death.—The king reconciles his nobility.—An Assembly.—Disputes between the king and the Assembly.—Montgomery resigns his archbishopric.—Reappointment of archbishop Beaton.—The Assembly petition for the removal of the prelates from parliament.—Defence by the abbot of Kinloss.—Temporalities of the bishoprics annexed to the crown.—A scheme to extirpate the prelates.—Increase of Jesuits and seminary priests.—Spanish armada.—James's measures.—Insolence of one of the brethren.——1588.—Extraordinary Assembly.—Bruce the moderator.—Resolutions adopted.—Their rude intrusion on the king—their demands.—Parliament enact the punishment of death against the Jesuits.—The Band.—Another Assembly.—A fast.—Marriage of the earl of Huntly.—Dispute with Adamson.——1589.—Petition of some ministers.—National covenant subscribed—the king's opinion of it—the effects of it.—An Assembly.—Articles proposed by the king for subscription—but refused.—Practices of the popish peers.—Dispute betwixt the Assembly and Adamson.——1590.—The king's marriage—his letter to the council—voyage to Denmark and return.—Coronation of the queen.—Gibson still allowed to preach.—An Assembly.—James Melville's sermon—chiefly directed against archbishop Adamson—the king present in it—his speech—shown to be apocryphal—toleration not then understood.—The church the pillar and ground of the truth.——1591.—Death of

superintendent Erskine.—Treasons of the earl of Bothwell—his character and practices.—Troubles caused by Melville—his feud with the court of session.—Death of archbishop Adamson.—A schism.—Melville cited by the synod of Lothian.——1592.—An Assembly—petition parliament for a ratification of the presbyterian discipline—for the prelates to be removed from parliament.—The establishment of presbytery, and permission for holding annual assemblies.—Familiar address of the brethren to the king.—Titular bishops not removed.

1575.—This year ushers in a new era in the ecclesiastical history of the kingdom. It is from the period of the autumn Assembly of this year that the presbyterian model of church government in Scotland dates its existence. It has continued ever since more or less to agitate the kingdom to the present day, and is the prolific parent of all the schisms which have divided and afflicted the church in the three kingdoms ever since its introduction. Its rise and progress, the divisions, contentions, seditions, rebellions, and revolutions, which its restless and ungovernable spirit has produced in these kingdoms, shall be faithfully traced. Hitherto we have seen a decidedly episcopal government, exercised by the superintendents, and quietly, cheerfully, and universally acquiesced in by the whole body of the ministers and the people committed to their charge. The General Assembly never in any one instance challenged or disputed the episcopal powers of the superintendents, but enacted laws and canons for their just power, and for preventing them from abusing the powers committed to them. The superintendents were frequently censured for neglecting the duties of their office; but there is not one single instance on record of the episcopal office itself having been challenged by any member of any General Assembly for fifteen years; that is, from the establishment of the Superintendent or Knoxian Church to the entrance on the stage of the fierce and turbulent Andrew Melville, the father of Scottish presbytery. Calderwood informs us, "that Master Andrew Melville returned to Scotland, in July (1574), after he had been ten years absent, and had regented in Poictiers and Geneva many years. Beza," (the true parent of presbytery,) "in his letter to the General Assembly, wrote, that the greatest token the kirk of Geneva could shew to Scotland was, that they had suffered themselves to be spoiled of Master Andrew Melville, that thereby the kirk of Scotland may be enriched[1]." "He was a man," says Sage, "by nature fierce and fiery, confident and peremptory, peevish and ungovernable. Education in him had not

[1] Calderwood, p. 66.

sweetened nature, but nature had soured education, and both conspiring together, had tricked him up into a true original; a piece compounded of pride and petulance, of jeer and jangle, of satire and sarcasm, of venom and vehemence. He hated the crown as much as the mitre, the sceptre as much as the crosier, and could have made as bold with the purple as with the rochet. His prime talent was lampooning and writing anti-tami-cami-categorias. In a word, he was the very archetipal bitter beard of the party[1]." The regent directed George Buchanan and Alexander Hay, clerk of council, to offer him the place of his domestic chaplain, with the promise of advancement on the first vacancy. His intention, says Calderwood, "was to have him and his gifts framed to his purpose—that is, to restrain the freedom of application in preaching, and the authority of General Assemblies, *and to bring in conformity with England in the church government*; without which he thought he could not govern the country to his fantasy, or that agreement could stand long between the two countries. First he tried men of the best gifts at court; and if he found they would serve his purpose, his intention was to advance them to bishopries. Howbeit Master Andrew was not acquainted with his intentions; yet was he not willing to serve at court, but rather to be a professor in some university[2]." There is no reason whatever to suppose that this man was ever ordained to any holy function in the church; nor so much as *admitted* according to the new protestant forms that had been introduced by Knox. He was a mere layman, but in that respect he was not in a worse condition than the greatest number of the Knoxian ministers, who were men that judged themselves *qualified* to exercise the sacred duties of the christian ministry, to act as mediators between God and the people, and to enter into covenant on His part for the performance of the divine promises in the holy sacraments; which was a horrid cheat upon the people, a "keeping the word of promise to their *ears*, but breaking it to their *hope*."

The spring Assembly of this memorable year met in March, when a committee was formed to receive the defence of the bishop of Moray, for some slander which he had occasioned. And the archbishop of Glasgow complaining that his diocese was too large, and of his inability, in consequence, to visit all the churches within it, the Assembly appointed Patrick Adamson and Andrew Hay, as commissioners, superintendents, or archdeacons, to visit certain parts of his diocese. These com-

[1] Fundamental Charter of Presbytery. [2] Calderwood, p. 66.

missioners were similar in power and authority to archdeacons, who have not the power which belongs peculiarly to the province of a bishop of either ordination or confirmation. The regent presented Andrew Grahame, bishop elect of Dunblane, to the Assembly, who appointed a commission to examine his fitness and abilities for that office. And at the same time the Assembly enacted, that from henceforward "no chapter proceed to the election of a bishop to any bishopric before he give proof of his doctrine, life, and conversation, before themselves, and that thereafter he report the testimonial of the Assembly to the chapter, that they then may proceed to the election[1]." This solicitude of the Assembly "to try the spirits," shows a laudable desire to preserve the episcopal office pure from the intrusion of ignorant or improper men, and was far from indicating that they thought that office either a burdensome tyranny, or an anti-scriptural usurpation. Such canons also showed that the Assembly contemplated the perpetuity of the episcopacy which was then established.

On the 6th of August, the autumn Assembly again met at Edinburgh, and Robert Pont, one of the judges of the Court of Session, was chosen moderator. The Assembly suspended the bishop of Dunkeld from his episcopal functions, for having neglected to excommunicate the earl of Athole. After a long debate they restored the bishop of Galloway to his functions, partly in consideration of his own submission, and partly at the request of the regent, on condition that he should confess his offence in the presence of the congregation of the abbey church on the following Sunday; but the sackcloth was dispensed with[1]. And as a proof that the festivals of the church were celebrated, in conformity with the pious custom of the whole church since the days of the apostles, a petition was presented by this Assembly to the regent, praying, "that all days which heretofore have been kept holy, besides the Sabbath-day, such as Yule or Christmas-day, saints' days, and such other, may be abolished, and a civil penalty be appointed against the keepers thereof, by ceremonies, banquetings, playings, fastings, and other like vanities[2]."

In this Assembly, Andrew Melville, a man of learning, "but hot and eager upon any thing he went about, labouring with a burning desire to bring into this church the presbyterial discipline of Geneva," first called the office and authority of a bishop in question, as then exercised in Scotland, and commenced those contentions and disputes which have divided the

[1] Calderwood, p. 67. [2] Ibid. p. 68.

church ever since. From the period of his return he had been secretly disseminating his sentiments of equality among ministers, and making a faction to oppose episcopacy. "The man," says Sage, "thus accoutred, was scarcely warm at home, when he began to disseminate his sentiments, insinuate them into others, and make a party against prelacy and for the Geneva model. For this I need not depend on Spottiswood's authority, though he asserts it plainly; I have a more authentic author for it, if more authentic can be; I have Melville himself for it, in a letter to Beza, dated November 13, 1579 (to be found both in Petrie, p. 401, and in the pamphlet called Vindiciæ Philadelphi, from which Petrie had it); of which letter the very first words are, 'we have not ceased these five years to fight against pseudo-episcopacy,' &c. Now, reckon five years backward from November 1579, and you stand at November 1574, whereby we find that within three or four months after his arrival, the plot was begun, though it was near to a year afterwards before it came above board. Having thus *projected* his work and formed his party, his next care was to get one to table it fairly. He himself was but lately come home; he was much a stranger in the country, having been ten years abroad; he had been at but very few General Assemblies, if at any; his influence was but green and budding, his authority but young and tender: it was not fit for him amongst his first appearances to propose so great an innovation. And it seems the thinking men of his party, however resolutely they might promise to back the motion when once fairly tabled, were yet a little shy to be the first proposers: so it fell to the share of one who at that time was none of the greatest statesmen[1]."

Having insinuated himself into favour with several of the influential ministers, he persuaded John Dury, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, to make the first open attack. "He was a sound-hearted man, far from all dissimulation, open, professing what he thought, earnest and zealous in his cause, whatever it was; but too, too credulous, and easily to be imposed upon[2]." He lived, however, to repent, when it was too late, of his credulity on this occasion, and earnestly to entreat on his death-bed, that the episcopacy, which he had the first hand in overthrowing, might be restored. On the 6th of August, while the doctrine, diligence, and lives of the titular bishops were under examination, Dury protested "that the trial of a bishop prejudges not the reasons which he and other bre-

[1] Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, p. 218-19. [2] Spottiswood.

threu of his mind had to propone against the *name* and *office* of a bishop[1]." Spottiswood says, he "propounded a question touching the lawfulness of the episcopal function, and the authority of chapters in their election." Melville, as if he had been previously unacquainted with Dury's intentions, seconded his motion, and after a long harangue on the flourishing state of the church of Geneva, and the *opinions* of Calvin and Beza, as if their opinions were both law and gospel, concluded with affirming, "that none ought to be office-bearers in the church, whose titles were not found in the Book of God. And for the title of bishops, albeit the same was found in Scripture, yet was it not to be taken in the sense that the common sort did conceive, there being no superiority allowed by Christ amongst ministers; he being the only Lord of his church, and all (being) the same servants in the same degree, and having the like power. That the corruptions crept into the estate of bishops were so great, it could not go well with the church, nor could religion be long preserved in purity[2]."

The fatal controversy thus begun, six collocutors were selected to confer and reason on the question at issue. David Lindsay, George Hay, and John Row, were appointed on the side of the episcopalians. Andrew Melville, James Lawson, and John Craig, three who espoused the presbyterian side of the argument, were appointed to meet the episcopalian deputies, "anent the question proponed by certain brethren whether the bishops, *as they are now in Scotland*, have their function from the word of God or not?" "After divers meetings, and long deliberation among themselves," they presented their opinions to the Assembly, in writing, as follows:—

1. That they did not hold it expedient to answer the questions proposed for the present; but if any bishop was chosen, that had not the qualities required by the word of God, he should be tried by the General Assembly, *de novo*, and so deposed, if there be cause.

2. That they judged the name of a bishop to be common to all ministers that had the charge of a particular flock, and that by the word of God his chief function consisted in the preaching the word, the ministration of the sacraments, and the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline, with consent of his elders.

3. That from among the ministers some one might be chosen to oversee and visit such reasonable bounds, besides his own flock, as the General Assembly should appoint.

[1] Calderwood, p. 68. [2] Spottiswood, b. v. p. 275.

4. That the ministers so elected might in those bounds appoint preachers, with the advice of the ministers of the province, and the consent of the flock to which they should be admitted. And also to appoint elders and deacons in every particular congregation where there are none, with consent of the people thereof.

5. That he might suspend ministers from the exercise of their office on reasonable causes, with the consent of the ministers of the bounds[1].

It is evident from these conclusions, but especially from the third article, that the arguments of the deputies on the episcopalian side prevailed, and which is acknowledged by Calderwood; for, says he, "it seemeth that by reason of the regent's authority, who was bent upon the course" (that is, bent upon episcopacy), "whereof he was the chief instrument, that they answered not directly to the question at this time." The same author says, they struck directly, not only at the name, but at the office of a bishop, and also of superintendents, "for the great affinity that is betwixt them[2]." The presbyterian party gained no ground on this first attempt to break down the titular episcopacy, as the conclusions of the six collocutors were agreeable to the existing form; and in their answer they tacitly allow the divine right of episcopacy, by their answering that it was not expedient to answer the question of the lawfulness of episcopacy at that time. The titular bishops were most culpably remiss in making no opposition to the tide of opposition which had now commenced to flow. There were present in this remarkable Assembly, six bishops, the archbishop of Glasgow, the bishops of Dunkeld, Galloway, Brechen, Dumblane and the Isles, and the three oldest superintendents of Lothian, Fife, and Angus; yet although they were so deeply interested in the question at issue, they neither were present at the conference, nor does it appear that they used any effort whatever to defend their office and calling. It is supposed they depended on the regent's power to quash any designs of their adversaries; but if they did, they fatally leant on a broken reed. The titular rulers of the church unfortunately thought themselves secure, that no such revolution as Melville and his associates contemplated could ever be accomplished, and, in pursuance of this fatal security, made no defence.

To make the government of the church thus alterable at the pleasure of fallible men, is in direct opposition to its original institution; for, like all other divine institutions, it must re-

[1] Spottiswood, b. v. pp. 275-6.—Calderwood, p. 69. [2] Calderwood, p. 69.

main in the same state in which it was instituted, till it shall please God to change or lay it aside; the same authority being required to *change* any institution that *first made it*. And, if man will presume to declare the functions of church officers to be mutable and temporary, without producing the least intimation of God's will that he has so designed them, they may, with the same reason, abolish all other christian institutions; and even the sacraments of the church will lie as much at their mercy as its ministers. The episcopal form of church government is of perpetual and universal obligation, and all christians, without exception, are bound to obey their spiritual rulers, the bishops, for without them there is no church. The offices of the christian church are as much of divine appointment as were those of the Jewish. It is the bishops alone that can convey the succession, which is the divine charter of the church; for to them alone was the commission given, and the immutable promise made,—"Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world;" that is, with their *office*, as conveyed "from hand to hand from the apostles." It was by a divine commission, that our Saviour, the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls, ordained or sent his apostles, whom he then raised up from being the middle order, to occupy the same place as governors, which he himself had done while on earth. By virtue of this commission these apostles were empowered to ordain or send others; and likewise this commission was to continue in the church, intrusted to that order to whom the apostles should convey it, as their successors, "even to the end of the world." The first public apostolic act was to raise up one of the formerly lowest, but now, by the elevation of the apostles, the middle order, into "the bishopric," which Judas by transgression had made vacant, and their next was to lay hands on "the seven men of honest report," whom the middle order, the seventy disciples, presented to them. Here may be seen three distinct orders in the ministry, the highest of which only assumed the right of the laying on of hands: and it is equally plain to any one reading the Holy Scriptures with singleness of heart, and free from prejudice, that there were *three* distinct orders in the christian church in the apostles' days, and which were designed to continue "always, even to the end of the world." For, besides those two which Andrew Melville "and those of his mind" allow,—deacons, and those called presbyters, elders, and sometimes bishops,—there was certainly another order, superior to both these, that had authority over the others. Such were Timothy and Titus, and many others who are called apostles in the Scriptures, besides the twelve apostles; for it is

evident from St. Paul's epistles to them, that they presided over many presbyters, had power to compel them to the performance of their duty, to receive accusations against them, and *judicially* to pass sentence on them, which are sufficient marks of superiority. But these are not the only names clothed with apostolic authority by the apostles, of which we read; all antiquity allow that St. James, surnamed the Just, the first bishop of Jerusalem, and Epaphroditus, whom St. Paul calls an apostle, or as in our translation a messenger,—were apostles or bishops. He designates the latter his "*brother* and *companion* in labour; *but your apostle;*" and charges the Philippians "to receive him in the Lord with all gladness, and to hold *such* in reputation[1]." St. Paul also mentions the apostles, or, as it is in our translation, the *messengers* of the churches, in another place: "Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you; or our *brethren* be inquired of, they are the *messengers* (*Gr.* apostles) of the churches, and the glory of Christ[2]." The angels of the seven churches of Asia also were their apostles, messengers, or bishops. Barnabas, Sylvanus, and Timothy, are called apostles[3]; and the two epistles to the Thessalonians were written in the joint names of the apostles Paul, Sylvanus, and Timothy. St. Paul, "and Sosthenes *our brother*," or fellow apostle, jointly wrote the first epistle to the Corinthians; and he united his brother apostle Timothy in the second epistle; and whom he afterwards sent from Athens to establish that church. St. Peter calls Sylvanus "a faithful brother;" and it is very well known that the apostle Sylvanus was the first resident bishop of Corinth. St. Paul calls Andronicus and Junia apostles[4]; and he places Apollos on an equality of office with himself and St. Peter. It is a mere logomachy, or play upon words, to say that the names of bishops and presbyters are used in Scripture for the same office, for it is certain that they are not so used. But in the apostolic times the office of *bishop*, as we now call it, was named *apostle;* and this illustrious title was afterwards confined to those apostles only who had been immediately constituted by our Lord. Theodoret, an ecclesiastical historian who wrote about the year 410, says, "formerly the *same persons* were called both *presbyters* and *bishops*, and those *now* called *bishops* were *then called apostles;* but in process of time the name of apostle was left to those apostles strictly so called, and the *name of bishop ascribed to all the rest.*"

[1] Phil. ii. 25. 29. [2] 2 Cor. viii. 23. [3] Acts, xiv. 4. 14.—1 Thess. ii. 6.
[4] Rom. xvi. 7.—1 Cor. iii. 5, 6, 22.

Presbytery, or equality among ministers, which "breedeth strifes," met with but a cold reception from this General Assembly, which was determined to maintain the titular episcopacy then established. The Assembly ordered a petition to be presented to "my lord regent's grace," containing nine articles, whereof the first was—"*Imprimis*, For planting and preaching the word through the whole realm, it is desired that so many ministers as may be had, who are yet unplaced, may be received, as well in the country to relieve the charge of them who have many kirks, as otherwise through the whole realm, with superintendents or commissioners within these bounds where bishops are not, and to help such bishops as have too great charges; and that livings be appointed to the aforesaid persons; and also payment to them who have travelled before as commissioners in the years of God 1573 and 1574, and so forth in time coming, without which the travels of such men will cease[1]." From this petition, the Assembly appears to have maintained its usual principles as heretofore, to put a stop to the uniting of churches,—a scheme of Morton's,—and to increase the number of those clothed with episcopal power, to continue that power in the church, and to provide competent livings for the prelates "*in time coming*," which words surely imply *perpetuity*, if they mean any thing.

1576.—The spring Assembly of this year met at Edinburgh, the 24th of April; and John Row, minister of Perth, was chosen moderator.

The total failure of Melville's first attack had convinced him, "and those of his mind," that they had been too precipitate in stating their objections against the lawfulness of the episcopal office. They had taken the Assembly by surprise, by thus abruptly calling in question the lawfulness of an office which had been so early, so universally, so usefully, so incontestibly received by the Catholic Church, and which had existed in their own church from the commencement of the reformation without any challenge. This was a point of great importance; for, to declare that office unlawful, was in effect to condemn the primitive churches, which had owned and flourished under it: it was to condemn the Scottish reformation and reformers, who had never questioned, but cheerfully obeyed it, and had proceeded all along on principles which clearly acknowledged, not only its lawfulness, but necessity; and it was also to condemn all those General Assemblies, which, immediately before, had so much authorised and confirmed it. Besides, to

[1] Pet. and MS. cited in Fund. Ch.

declare episcopacy to be unlawful, and, consequently, to abolish the office of a bishop, was the surest way to alienate entirely what little remained of the church's property, and to expose it to the merciless grasp of the sacrilegious laity, from whom the different Assemblies had never ceased endeavouring to recover it. The agreement at Leith was the only security the church then had for preserving what little of her property had been left, and therefore, to turn out the bishops, was to give it up entirely. In this Assembly, Melville and his friends, sensible of their error in the last Assembly, yet determined in their course for subverting the titular episcopacy, altered the state of the question to, "Whether bishops, as they *were then in Scotland*, had their function warranted by the word of God?"[1] But even in this new face which they assumed they met with as little success as before,—so stubborn a thing is episcopacy, and so difficult to overcome; for "the whole Assembly for the most part, after reasoning and long disputation on every article of the brethren's (viz. the six collocutors) opinion and advice, resolutely approved and affirmed the same, and every article thereof, as the same was given in by them[2]. Spottiswood says that the Assembly did not give a direct answer; but, after long reasoning, *approved* the opinions presented in the last meeting, with this addition: "that the bishops should take themselves to the service of some one church within their diocese, and condescend upon the particular flock whereof they would accept the charge[3]."

In this resolution, three things are worthy of notice:—1. that whatever the Melvillian party might be, they were the *smaller party*. 2. That the whole Assembly for the most part were satisfied that they were in the right, for they approved and affirmed the articles deliberately, after reasoning and long disputation; and, besides, they did it resolutely. 3. The Melvillians were out-voted, even in this second position: the whole Assembly for the most part stood resolutely for episcopacy, as it was then established, and would not affirm it to be unlawful. From all which it is manifest, that the presbyterian scheme met with *the most decided opposition, on its* FIRST APPEARANCE *in Scotland*[4]; and the church and people of Scotland did not think at that time that episcopacy was an antichristian usurpation, or "that prelacy and the superiority of any office in the church above presbyters, is, and hath been, a great and insupportable grievance to this nation, and contrary to

[1] Spottiswood, b. v. 276.—Fund. Charter, 226, 228. [2] Calderwood, 72.
[3] Spottiswood, b. v. 276. [4] Fund. Chart. Presb. 229.

the inclinations of the generality of the people, ever since the reformation[1].

As this Assembly stood firm for the titular episcopacy then established, so they continued to maintain the same sentiments and views with all preceding Assemblies. For the recovery and preservation of the property of the church, they enacted, "that they might proceed against unjust possessors of the church's patrimony, in respect of the notorious scandal, not only by doctrine and admonition, but with the censures of the church; and that the patrimony of the church, whereupon the church, the poor, and the schools should be maintained, was *ex jure divino*[2]."

Although the founder of Scottish presbyterianism was completely foiled in these two Assemblies, in his attempts to introduce his system of equality, yet he gained two points, which were exceedingly useful to the new cause: the first was, "that the bishops should take themselves to the service of some one particular church within their diocese, and condescend on the particular flocks whereof they would accept the charge." This arrangement, although it was intended to humble and confine the bishops in the exercise of their jurisdiction, yet did not in the least militate against the essentials of episcopacy, nor bring the established system any nearer that equality among ministers "that breedeth strifes," to which Melville and his small party so pertinaciously adhered. The second and most decided advantage which the presbyterians gained, was, a preconcerted message from Morton, who, being displeased with the deposition of James Paton, bishop of Dunkeld, that had been, in a former Assembly, suspended for dilapidating his benefice, sent to inquire of them "Whether *they would stand* to the policy agreed to at Leith? and if not, to desire them *to settle on some form of government at which they would abide.*" It is not possible to conceive that this fatal message was the effect of chance; there cannot be a doubt but that Morton had a deep design in thus throwing a bone of contention among the ministers. As before mentioned, if the order of bishops, and by consequence the benefices allotted for their maintenance, were removed and abolished, there must be a new division of the spoil. None were more deeply implicated in the guilty sacrilege of the times than the earl of Morton was; and the lands which had fallen to his share had no doubt sharpened his appetite for more. There was nothing more easy to him than to have crushed Melville and his project,

[1] Claim of Right, 1688. [2] Petrie, and MS., cited Fund. Charter, 230.

if he had been so disposed, especially as he had the majority of the Assembly on his side; but his notorious avarice prompted him, contrary to his duty as a regent, to embroil the ministers with the newly introduced controversy, and thus to open a door for the further spoliation of the church's patrimony. Nothing could possibly have been more opportune than this fatal message for the advancement of the presbyterian plot; for it gave them a colourable pretext to proceed in their levelling career with some pretence of authority. Accordingly, they eagerly seized the critical moment, and promptly replied to his grace's message, "that they were to think of that business, and should with all diligence set down a constant form of church policy, and present the same to be allowed by the council[1]."

It would have been an easy matter for Morton to have crushed the Melvillian party on their first appearance; for they were decidedly the minority, and, besides, Melville himself says the whole peerage was against him. If Morton had no interest in the advancement of the presbyterian scheme, it was very unfortunate that he threw such an apple of discord into the Assembly; "but," says bishop Sage, "considering all things, it looks so very like a plot, that it cannot but be very hard to persuade a thinking man that there was none." Morton was wretchedly covetous, and would commit any wickedness which he thought would be subservient to his own interest. His share of the church's spoils had made him desirous of acquiring more of her property. He began to feel by experience that the assemblies were more tenacious of what was left than they had hitherto been, and they shewed a disposition to resist farther dilapidation. But "he found that now contention was arising within her own bowels, and a party was appearing zealous for *innovations*, and that her peace and unanimity were likely to be broken and divided; and what more proper for him, in these circumstances, than to lay the reins on their necks, and cast a further bone of contention among them? He knew full well what it was 'to fish in *troubled* waters,' and so it is more than probable he would not neglect such an opportunity[2]."

It was the general policy of queen Elizabeth to foment confusions in Scotland, and it is certain that she encouraged the presbyterian scheme on its first appearance; and Morton was so dependent on her support, that he entered into her views, notwithstanding his former favour to episcopacy. Her

[1] Spottiswood, *ut sup.* p. 276. [2] Fundamental Charter, 234, 235.

influence was supreme in Scotland, and the presbyterian controversy was just the sort of "troubled waters" in which she delighted to fish; "and can it be imagined she would not encourage it when once it got footing? Certainly she understood it better than so: the sect had set up a presbytery at Wandsworth, in Surrey, in the year 1572; before Morton made his proposition, and seven years *before* a presbytery was so much as heard of in Scotland. No doubt she knew the *spirit* well enough, and how apt and well suited it was for keeping a state in disorder and trouble. . . . . Let all these things be laid together, and then let the judicious reader consider if it is not more than probable that, as England had a main hand in the advancement of our reformation, so it was not wanting to contribute for the advancement of presbytery also; and that Morton playing England's game, which was so much interwoven with his own, made this *ill-favoured* proposition to this General Assembly. But however this was, whether he had such a *plot* or not, it is clear that his making this proposition had all the effects he could have projected by bringing on such a plot[2]."

But the presbyterian scheme might have advanced more rapidly had not a misunderstanding fallen out betwixt the regent and the Assembly. John Douglas had recently died, and the regent recommended PATRICK ADAMSON, his own chaplain, to be elected as his successor: but the dean and chapter, or, as they were now called, the moderator and diocesan assembly, purposely delayed the election till the meeting of the Assembly. This being brought officially before the Assembly, Adamson, who was then present, was interrogated whether he would submit himself to trial, and accept the see on such conditions as the Assembly would prescribe. To which he answered, that he was prohibited by the regent from accepting the bishopric upon any other terms than those which had been agreed upon between the commissioners of the kirk and the lords of the council. In consequence, the Assembly inhibited the chapter from electing Adamson; but on Morton issuing a peremptory mandate, the chapter elected him to be archbishop. This so irritated the meek and lowly ministers that in the next Assembly they cited him before a commission, and inhibited him from exercising any part of his jurisdiction till he should be authorized by a General Assembly. This prohibition, on the other hand, so exasperated the regent, that he prevented their making any immediate innovation on the established government of the

[2] Fund. Charter, 210, 211.

kirk[1]. Adamson, says Keith, "did not receive, for what we know, any ecclesiastical consecration. He was a person of good literature, and had many contests about episcopacy and the order of bishops, with the presbyterian brethren and their assemblies. He was a person well learned, and an excellent preacher."

The agreement at Leith had been received by the succeeding Assembly as an interim only; but as a revision of that concordat might put an end to some controversies, and as the regent had made this proposition, and might ratify what they should agree to, probably induced this Assembly to entertain his dangerous proposition. A commission was forthwith issued to about twenty members, including the two prime instruments of presbytery, Andrew Melville and James Lawson, to compose a *Second* Book of Discipline, which gave the presbyterian party a wonderful advantage over their conservative brethren. They had their parts well digested beforehand, having been in regular correspondence with Theodore Beza, the founder of the presbyterian system; and they were therefore more than a match for the other ministers, whose controversial learning had been more exercised in disputing the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome, than in composing Books of Discipline. "They had taken," says Sage, "the ancient government, so far at least as it subsisted by imparity, upon trust, as they found it had been practised in all ages of the church;—perceiving in it a great deal of order and beauty, and nothing that naturally tended to have a bad influence on either the principles or the life of serious christianity; and with that they were satisfied. Indeed, even the best of them seem to have had very little skill in the true fountains whence the solid subsistence of the episcopal order was to be derived,—the Scriptures, I mean,—not as glossed by the private spirit of every modern novelist, but as interpreted and understood by the first ages,—as sensed by the constant and universal practice of genuine, primitive, and Catholic antiquity[2]."

Boyd, archbishop of Glasgow, behaved with great spirit in this Assembly. When they urged him to take charge of a particular flock, he refused, alleging "that he had entered to his office according to the order taken by the church and estates, and could do nothing contrary thereto, lest he should be thought to have transgressed his oath, and be challenged for altering a member of the estate. Yet that it might appear how willing

[1] Spottiswood, b. x. 276.—Heylin's Hist. of Presbytery, 181.

he was to bestow the gifts wherewith God had endued him to the good of the church, he should teach ordinarily at Glasgow when he had his residence in that city, and when he remained in the sheriffdom of Ayr, he should do the like in any church they should appoint: but without restricting himself unto the same, and prejudging in any sort the jurisdiction he had received at his admission." It is much to be regretted that the other titular bishops had not spoken with the same spirit and decision, instead of silently allowing Melville to proceed in his innovations. Spottiswood innocently remarks, "This his declaration made, he was no more troubled with that employment[1]." The Assembly were for the present satisfied with this prelate's answer, but referred the matter to the next General Assembly, which is a fair evidence that the presbyterian party was still the weakest; but they made up for their weakness and the paucity of their numbers by the most pertinacious perseverance and foresight. They contrived to procure an enactment, "that all ministers within eight miles, &c. should resort to the place of exercise, &c.[2]" This enactment was most useful for their ultimate designs; for as yet there were no such things as presbyterial meetings, and when they came to be established, some years afterwards, these meetings *for exercise* were adroitly turned into presbyteries, although originally they were only intended by Knox "to exercise themselves in the interpretation of Scripture, in imitation of the practice in use among the Corinthians[3]."

1577.—The General Assembly met at Edinburgh the first of April, and chose Alexander Arbuthnot, principal of Aberdeen College, moderator. In this Assembly, the presbyterians gained an advantage, by the archbishop of St. Andrews being cited to answer before some commissioners that had been appointed to try and examine him; and, in the interim, that he should be discharged from exercising his episcopal functions "till he should be admitted by the church[4]." The presbyterians advanced another step, by the appointment of a national fast. The causes of this fast are stated to have been "iniquity overflowing the whole face of the country; perilous storms and persecution daily invading the kirk in France, and elsewhere: *and for the work of establishing perfect order and policy within this kirk, which is presently in hands, that it may have a good success*[5]." This fast was to commence on, and continue for, two successive Sun-

[1] Spottiswood, b. v. p. 276.—Calderwood, p. 74.
[2] MSS. Petrie, cited in Fund. Charter of Presb. [3] First Book of Discipline.
[4] Calderwood, p. 76. [5] Ibid. 78.

days, which was contrary to all rule, as Sunday, in memory of our Lord's resurrection on the first day of the week, has ever been held as *a festival* in the christian church. "It has been one of the politics of the sect to be mighty for fasts," says Sage, "when they had extraordinary projects in their heads; and then if these projects (however wicked, nay, the very wickedness which the Scripture makes as bad as witchcraft) succeed, to entitle them to God's grace, and make the success the comfortable return of their pious humiliations and sincere devotions."

A form of church policy was drawn up by the presbyterian party, differing materially from the First Book of Discipline, and commissioners were appointed to wait on the regent, to inform him that they were busy about the matter and argument of the polity, and that his grace should receive advertisement of their further proceedings. In the preface to the Second Book, they protested "to wish nothing more than, as God had made him a notable instrument in purging the realm of popery, and settling the same in a perfect peace, that He would also honour him with the establishment of a godly and spiritual policy in the church; entreating his grace to receive the articles presented; and if any of them *did not seem agreeable to reason*, to vouchsafe audience to the brethren, whom they had named to attend;—not that they did account it a work complete, to which nothing might be added, or from which nothing might be diminished, *for, as God should* REVEAL FURTHER *unto them*, they should be willing to help and renew the same[1]." The commissioners reported to the Assembly, "that his grace liked well of their travels and labours taken in that matter, and required expedition and hasty outred. As for the particulars, (said he) let them be given in, and they shall receive a *good answer*[2]." The last clause of this answer bears a strong confirmation of the regent's collusion with the presbyterian scheme of revolution. And farther, he appointed a conference between some ministers and members of the privy council, for agreeing on the recent devout revelation of the new reformers; but the conference was broken up on account of the feuds and seditions which occurred at that time, and also by the approaching ruin of their avaricious patron. Leslie says that "*Erastianism ran down like a* TORRENT *from the Reformation*;" and in this preamble by the founder of the presbyterian communion, Erastianism is boldly and unblushingly avowed, conjoined with the rationalism of the present day, wherein

[1] Spottiswood b. v. 277. [2] Calderwood, p. 77.

they made the regent the judge of the fitness or unfitness of what they broadly asserted *was revealed to them from heaven!* If it was a matter of revelation, as they do not scruple to assert, it would have been *perfect* at once, and their declaration that it might be added to or diminished, with their submitting it to the decision of the regent's judgment, were surely insults offered to the Spirit of Grace[1].

In this Assembly it was asked, What shall be done to ministers and readers, that in Lent, or on Saints'-days, or Pasch and Yule (Easter and Christmas), read, preach, or minister the communion? It was answered, that the visitor, with advice of the synodal Assemblies, ought to admonish such ministers or readers to desist and abstain, under the pain of deprivation; and if they disobey, to deprive them[2]." This is a clear proof that the festivals of the whole church were celebrated by the titular episcopal church of Scotland, and that they were not discontinued till the genius of presbytery began to preside in the General Assemblies.

The autumn Assembly met on the 25th of October, but in it the presbyterian party still appear to have been the weaker, for there was nothing done for their advancement, or the humbling of the episcopacy. About this time, Beza's discourse of divine, human, and satanical bishops, made its appearance, which greatly assisted Melville in his new design; but the resignation of the regency by the earl of Morton, at this time, was of infinitely more importance to the presbyterians. Although he had rendered them essential service, yet he was so crafty and avaricious that they could not trust him, and they lived in continual apprehension of his overreaching them. They had the advantage, however, of his precept to draw a new plan of government; and they had a young prince only twelve years of age to deal with, and consequently were likely enough to have a divided court and a factious nobility. They very sagaciously calculated, therefore, that one or other of these factions would be sure to court them, and undertake to promote their interests.

In the third session of this Assembly, it was ordained, that all bishops and others bearing ecclesiastical function be called by their own names, or *brethren*, in time coming; Calderwood always denominates the most fierce, fiery, and intractable of them, as "*godly* brethren."

The Assembly appointed a national fast to be observed throughout the whole kingdom, as the affections of the people

[1] Revelations, xxii. 18, 19. [2] Calderwood, p. 78.

were not yet sufficiently disposed for presbytery, to continue for a whole week, in consequence of "corruptions in all estates, coldness in great part of the professors, increase of fearful sins and enormities, domestic seditions and dissensions,—the bloody conclusions of that Roman beast: *and also to establish such a policy and discipline in the kirk* as is craved in the word of God, and is conceived and penned already, to be presented to his highness and council[1]." It must be acknowledged, that the above black catalogue of sins is to be ascribed to the political preaching which had been so long in fashion, and to the deep rebellion of the queen's enemies, who, having set aside the lawful possessor of the throne, and, by treason and bloodshed, secured for a faction the whole dominion, placing an unconscious infant on his mother's throne, they were compelled to support their usurpation by the same bloody means. The major part of the nobility were loyal to their imprisoned queen, but whom the regents harassed and persecuted with unrelenting barbarity. Dr. Cook candidly owns, "that the ecclesiastical polity introduced by Melville exerted in Scotland the malignant influence that might have been anticipated from it; which extinguished the feelings and hardened the hearts of those who gloried in supporting it, which spread all the rancour of exasperated bigotry throughout the community, and gave rise to scenes of intolerance and persecution, from which every humane and christian spirit must shrink with the strongest disapprobation[2]."

On the 15th September, Morton resigned the regency, having sufficient sagacity to foresee the storm that was gathering, and wisely resolved to shelter himself from its fury. Avarice was his ruling passion. Robert Reid, the last Roman bishop of Orkney, "left a great sum of money for building the College of Edinburgh, which the earl of Morton converted to his own use and profit, by banishing the executors of bishop Reid for supposed crimes[3]." He was thoroughly and abjectly the creature of Elizabeth, and her willing instrument in embroiling the nation in all its ecclesiastical feuds and animosities. He cheated the ministers out of their revenues, and, in consequence, he excited among them a host of enemies. He coined and issued base money, but which he refused to accept in payment of his exactions; and he most cruelly oppressed the common people. He betrayed and sold the duke of Northumberland to Elizabeth, who had sought shelter in Scotland; and besides he

[1] Calderwood. [2] Cook's Hist. Church of Scotland, vol. i. 250.
[3] Keith's Catalogue of Scottish Bishops, p. 225.

was guilty of repeated breaches of faith, and acts of despotic tyranny, so that the whole kingdom groaned under the most cruel oppression, and was disgusted and united against him as one man. His temporary resignation, however, was of the utmost importance to the presbyterian party, for the reasons already named.

To James's youth and inexperience must be added, in favour of the presbyterians, the unaccountable neglect of the titular bishops, their dastardly supineness and guilty lukewarmness. They made no effort to protect their flocks, nor defend their office, against the innovations of the presbyterian party, which was now gaining strength daily, from sheer impudence and agitation. But these new reformers so harassed and insulted the bishops with insolent scurrilities and personal incivilities, as deterred them from speaking in their own defence, lest from words they should proceed to blows, which in that rude age, and in their hostile temper, would have been no way surprising.

1578.—The General Assembly met at Edinburgh, on the 24th of April, when the chief presbyterian and its founder in Scotland, Andrew Melville, was chosen moderator.

During the rude contentions of political parties, by which the earl of Morton had been supplanted in the regency, and the young prince had assumed the reigns of government, the presbyterians presented the "Second Book of Discipline," which had only just been completed, to the parliament, which met at Stirling. Being occupied with other subjects, some of its members were appointed to meet and confer with the commissioners of the Assembly; that if they agreed, the book might be inserted in the journals of parliament. Some of the articles were agreed to, and others were peremptorily rejected; for it was a strange compound of democracy and inconsistency. They ushered in their new constitution with the following preamble; and that discipline must indeed have been most admirable, which could have removed such extensive and abominable iniquity, as every Assembly lamented, and which showed that sacrilege had produced the fruits of the flesh, and that the kingdom was given up to a reprobate mind. We shall not find, however, that the new model propitiated the Spirit of grace, or that His fruits of holiness were the consequence of this democratical amendment.

"The General Assembly of the kirk, finding universal corruption of the whole estates of the body of this realm, the great coldness and slackness in religion in the greatest part of the professors of the same, with the *daily increase* of all

kinds of fearful sins and enormities; as incest, adultery, murder, cursed sacrilege, ungodly sedition and division within the bowels of the realm, with all manner of disordered and ungodly living; which justly has provoked our God, although long suffering and patient, to stretch out his arm in his anger to correct and visit the iniquity of the land; and namely, by the present penury, famine, and hunger, joined with the civil and intestine seditions: whereunto doubtless greater judgments must succeed, if these His corruptions work no reformation and amendment in men's hearts. Seeing also the bloody conclusions of the cruel councils of that Roman beast, tending to exterminate and rase from the face of all Europe the true light of the blessed word of salvation: For these causes, and that God of his mercy would bless the king's highness, and his regiment, and make him to have a happy and prosperous government, as also to put in his highness's heart, and in the hearts of his noble estates of parliament, not only to make and establish good politic laws for the weal and good government of the realm, but also to set and establish such a polity and discipline in the kirk as is craved in the word of God, and is contained and penned already to be presented to his highness and council; that in the one and in the other God may have His due praise, and the age to come an example of upright and godly dealing."

It appears from what follows that the new discipline differed entirely from the primitive and apostolic government of the church of Christ, and from the discipline which Knox and his coadjutors introduced, and to which cheerful obedience had been given for eighteen years. In chap. ii. sec. 9, it is decidedly stated, "That there are *four* ordinary offices or functions in the church of God,—the pastor, minister, or bishop; the doctor; the presbyter, or elder; and the deacon. Sec. 10. These offices are ordinary, and ought to continue perpetually in the church, as necessary for the government and policy of the same; and no more offices ought to be received, or suffered in the true church of God, established by his word. Sec. 11. Therefore all the ambitious titles invented in the kingdom of antichrist, and his usurped hierarchy, which are not of those sorts, together with the offices depending thereon, ought in one word to be rejected." Chap. v., Of doctors, and their offices. "One of the two ordinary and perpetual functions that labour in the word, is the office of *doctor*, who may also be called prophet, bishop, elder, and catechiser,—that is, the teacher of the catechism and the rudiments of religion. Sect. 2. His office is, to open up the mind of the Spirit of God in the scriptures simply,

without such application as the minister uses, to the end that the faithful may be instructed in sound doctrine, the purity of the gospel taught, and not corrupted through ignorant and evil opinions. Sec. 3. He is different from the pastor, not only in name, but in diversity of gifts; for to the doctor is given the *gift of knowledge*, to open up by simple teaching the mysteries of faith: to the pastor the gift of *wisdom*, to apply the same by exhortation to the manners of the flock, as occasion craves. Sec. 4. Under the name and office of doctor, we comprehend also the order in schools, colleges, and universities, which have from time to time been carefully maintained, as well among Jews and Christians as among profane nations. Sec. 5. The doctor being an elder, should assist the pastor in the government of the church, and concur with the elders his brethren in all Assemblies, by reason the interpretation of the word, which is only judged in matters ecclesiastical, is committed to his charge. Sec. 6. But to preach unto the people, to minister the sacraments, and celebrate marriages, pertains not to the doctor, unless he be otherwise called ordinarily; yet may the pastors teach in schools, as he who hath the gift of knowledge oftentimes, which the example of Polycarpus and others testify[1]."

It is not possible to conceive a greater confusion than is contained in this chapter. The compilers say, there are *four* orders in the church; but their offices and functions are so jumbled together, that it is impossible to define exactly their duties. How different such a system of man's devising this is from the beautiful order and simplicity of the apostolic church! It is impossible for the maintainers of this system to produce corresponding orders in Scripture for their doctors and lay-elders; and, therefore, according to their own assertion, when episcopacy was first called in question, "none ought to be office-bearers in the church, whose titles were not found in the book of God." And, as these titles cannot be found there, this "corruption" ought to be removed, "as, unless the same was removed, it could not go well with the church, nor could religion be long preserved in purity[2]." "There cannot be," says Sage, "a greater evidence of the unskilfulness of the clergy in these times, in the ancient records of the church, than their suffering Melville and his party to obtrude upon them the Second Book of Discipline; a split-new democratical system, a very farce of novelties, never heard of before in the

[1] Spottiswood, 189—302.—Second Book of Discipline, contained in Confession of Faith. [2] Melville's Speech in Assembly, 1575.

christian church. For instance, what else is the confounding the offices of bishops and presbyters, the making doctors or professors of divinity in colleges and universities, a distinct office, and of divine institution? the setting up of lay-elders as governors of the church, *jure divino?* making them judges of men's qualifications to be admitted to the sacrament? visitors of the sick, &c.? making the colleges of presbyters in cities in the primitive times lay-eldersnips? prohibiting appeals from Scottish General Assemblies to any judge, civil or ecclesiastical; and by consequence, to œcumenical councils? Are these ancient and catholic assertions? What footsteps of these in true antiquity? How easy had it been for men skilled in the constitution, government, and discipline of the primitive church, to have laid open to the conviction of all sober men, the novelty, the vanity, the inexpediency, the impoliticalness, the uncatholicalness of most, if not all, of these propositions[1]."

But many points of the Second Book of Discipline were taken word for word from Beza's answers to the lord chancellor Glammis' questions. His tract *de Triplici Episcopatu* was purposely written for the advancement of presbyterianism in Scotland, and his answers to lord Glammis' six questions contained the new scheme which was now produced by Melville and laid before parliament. It is a fair evidence of the ignorance of the ministers of catholic doctrines, and of the history and polity of the church, when they could passively permit such an uncatholic system to be forced upon them by the assurance of a single individual, and he almost a stranger, whose chief aim it was to be the founder of a sect, and to be called a *master* in Israel. "Now," says Sage, "let us taste a little of his skill in the constitution and government of the ancient church, or, if you please, of his accounts of her policy. I take his book as I find it amongst Saravia's works. He is positive for the *divine right* of ruling elders. He affirms that 'bishops arrogated to themselves the power of ordination without God's allowance; that the chief foundation of all ecclesiastical functions is popular election; that this election, and not ordination or imposition of hands, makes pastors or bishops; that imposition of hands does no more than put them in *possession* (that is, the exercise,) of their ministry, *the power* whereof they have from that election; that, by consequence, it is more proper to say that the fathers of the church are

[1] Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, p. 216.

created by the Holy Ghost and the suffrages of their children than by the bishops; that St. Paul, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, in which he expressly writes against and condemns the schism which then prevailed there, as foreseeing that episcopacy might readily be deemed a remedy against so great an evil, joined Sosthenes with himself in the inscription of the Epistle, that by his own example he might teach how much that princeliness was to be avoided in ecclesiastical conventions, seeing the apostles themselves, who are owned to have been next to Christ, first in order and supreme in degree, did yet exercise their power by the rules of parity.' Who will not at first sight think this a pretty odd fetch? But to go on, he further affirms, that episcopacy is so far from being a proper remedy against schism, that it has produced many grievous schisms which had never been but for that human invention. That the papacy was the fruit of episcopacy. That the council of Nice, by making that canon, that the ancient customs should continue, &c. cleared the way for the Roman papacy which was then advancing a pace; and founded a throne for that whore that sits upon the seven mountains. That the primitive churches were in a flourishing condition so long as their governors *continued to act in parity:* and yet he had granted before, that human episcopacy, as he calls it, was in vogue in Ignatius' time. So that I think they could not flourish *much*, having so *short* a time to flourish in."

The parliamentary commissioners agreed, for the time being, to such articles in the Second Book of Discipline as did not interfere with the authority and prerogative of the crown. Many of them, however, did, and of course they were either rejected or deferred till a future period, which the privy council postponed indefinitely, to the great annoyance of the presbyterian leaders. These worthy reformers, however, took the law into their own hand, and, without waiting for the legal ratification of their polity, they passed an act of Assembly of considerable importance for the new cause:—viz. "Forasmuch as there is great corruption in the estate of bishops, as they are at present set up in this realm, whereunto the Assembly would provide some stay in time coming, so far as they may, to the effect that farther corruption may be bridled; the Assembly hath concluded, that no bishop shall be elected or admitted before the next General Assembly, discharging all ministers and chapters to proceed anyways to the election of the said bishops, in the meantime, under the pain of perpetual deprivation; and that this matter be proponed first in the next

Assembly, to be consulted what farther order should be taken therein[1]." According to their usual custom, when any extraordinary innovation was contemplated, the Assembly in its seventh session appointed a *fast* to be observed throughout the whole kingdom, without consulting the civil authorities, who, in this matter, were put in subjection to the ecclesiastical estate: and with their usual opposition to all antiquity, religious principle, and common sense, the fast was to commence on the first *Sunday* in June, to continue the whole week, and to be concluded on the following *Sunday*, both Sundays included. The next General Assembly this year met at Stirling, the 11th of June, only six weeks after the spring meeting: but parliament meeting there, it was requisite for the good new cause that the Assembly should convocate for its own interest. Presbytery seems to have become more powerful as time advanced, for here the Assembly, all in one voice, concluded, "that the act of the last Assembly, discharging the election of bishops, &c. should be extended to all time coming, aye, and until the *corruptions* in the estate of bishops be utterly taken away[2]." The levellers had not yet given any indication of what these corruptions consisted. Another application was made to parliament to ratify the new book, although they had not finished it themselves, but which was still evaded.

A third Assembly met this year at Edinburgh, on the 24th of October, and D. Fergusson, minister of Dunfermline, was chosen moderator. No less than three General Assemblies in one year to usher in the birth of presbytery, and the era of a new and a more radical reformation! And now the corruptions so long complained of in the estate of bishops were at last enumerated, and the presbyterians commenced their hostilities on the mitre, by an attack on Boyd, archbishop of Glasgow, whom they expected to have been more tractable, and they desired him to submit himself to the Assembly, and suffer the corruptions of the episcopal estate to be reformed in his person. Careless, indifferent, and lukewarm, as the titular bishops had heretofore shewn themselves, in their opposition to Melville, Boyd answered their summons with becoming spirit and dignity, in writing as follows, an answer which Heylin says, "for the modesty or piety thereof deserves to be continued to perpetual memory:"—"I understand the name, office, and reverence given to a bishop to be lawful and allowable by the Scriptures of God, and having been elected by the church and king to be bishop of Glasgow, I esteem my office and

[1] Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, p. 216. [2] Calderwood, 81, 82.

calling lawful, and will endeavour with all my power to perform the duties required, submitting myself to the judgment of the church, if I shall be tried to offend, so as nothing be required of me but the performance of those duties which the apostle prescribeth. As to the rent, living, and privileges granted to me and my successors, I think I may lawfully and with a good conscience enjoy the same. And for assisting the king with my best service in council and parliament, as my subjection ties me thereto, so I esteem it no hurt, but a benefit to the church, that some of their number should be always present at the making of laws and statutes, wherein, for myself, I neither intend, nor, by the grace of God, shall ever do anything, but that which I believe may stand with the purity of the word of God, and the good of the church and country[1]."

The archbishop's letter was read in open court, and gave great offence to the brethren; and they commanded his grace to bethink himself, and return an answer more suitable to the presbyterian system; but Boyd refused any farther concession. A commission was therefore forthwith issued to Melville and some brethren of the west, to urge his subscription to the act made at Stirling for reformation of the episcopal estate,—that is, its extirpation; and, if the archbishop should prove refractory, which, from his courage and noble bearing in the Assembly, they expected he would be, they were empowered to proceed against him with the censures of the church, and, as far as they were able, to excommunicate and deliver him to the devil and his angels. This persecution was the more intolerable to the archbishop, who was a good man, and worthy of better times, on account of the base ingratitude and rude incivility of Melville, who had received many favours from Boyd. The archbishop had promoted him to be principal of Glasgow University; and he had been a frequent and welcome guest at his grace's table, where, it is remarkable, he always gave the archbishop his proper titles of dignity and honour; but in public, especially in public meetings, he would call him by his proper name, and use him with great familiarity and rudeness. "Nothing," says Spottiswood, "did more grieve him than the ingratitude of Mr. Andrew Melville, and his uncourteous forms. He had brought the man to Glasgow, placed him principal in the college, bestowed otherwise liberally upon him, and was paid for his kindness with the most disgraceful contempt." These commissioners exercised their delegated authority with the utmost rigour, and by working on

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 303.—Calderwood, pp. 84, 85.

the good man's fears, and threatening him with the thunders of the Assembly, they induced him to sign "certain articles," which gave him great uneasiness on his death-bed. He was, says Spottiswood, "a wise, learned, and religious prelate, and worthy to have lived in better times than he fell into. His corpse was solemnly buried in the quire of the cathedral, and laid in the sepulchre of Mr. Gavin Dunbar, one of his predecessors." His death was hastened by the public persecution and private insolence of the founder of Scottish presbytery, whose humility consisted not in his own lowliness of mind, but in the humbling of his superiors. The bishops were so persecuted by this system of personal incivility and rudeness, that they began to absent themselves from the meetings of Assembly, where their persons were now exposed to the coarsest insults, and their office to the most scurrilous insolence and abuse[1].

For the preceding three years, the corruptions in the estate of bishops had been the constant subject of declamation for our new reformers, but which had never yet been specified. However, in this Assembly the alleged corruptions, seven in number, were produced; and commissioners were appointed to summon Adamson, archbishop of St. Andrews before them, who had refrained from attending the Assembly, and charge him to remove the said "corruptions" in the estate of bishops, in his own person; ordaining him, with the other bishops that should submit themselves to correction, to subscribe the following eight articles, which, according to their logic, were sufficient to warrant the abolition of God's holy ordinance, for which the evidence is as strong as for the canon of the Holy Scriptures, or the articles of the creed:—

I. That the bishops should be content to be ministers and pastors of a flock. II. That they should not usurp any criminal jurisdiction. III. That they should not vote in parliament in name of the church, unless they had a commission from the General Assembly. IV. That they should not take up, for maintaining their ambition, the rents which might maintain many pastors, schools, and poor, but content themselves with a reasonable portion for discharging their office. V. That they should not claim the title of temporal lords, nor usurp any civil jurisdiction, whereby they may be withdrawn from their charges. VI. That they should not empire it over elderships, but be *subject* to the same. VII. That they should not usurp the power of elderships, nor take upon them

[1] "The small respect carried to bishops in these assemblies of the church, made them dishaunt, and come no more unto the same."—Spottiswood, b. vi. 393.

to visit any bounds that were not committed to them by the church. VIII. Lastly, it was provided, that if any more corruptions should afterwards be tried, the bishops should submit to have them reformed[1].

These articles, or corruptions, as they called them, were evidently intended for the total extirpation of the episcopal order. What could be more decisive than the sixth article, which ordains that the superior shall be subject to the *inferior?* Adamson's reply is not recorded, but as Boyd behaved with so much spirit, and refused subscription, it may be inferred that Adamson also declined to subscribe to these "corruptions," as he was repeatedly afterwards charged to submit, without effect. Calderwood pathetically laments, "that it was hard to get them (the bishops) reduced to the common order of simple ministers;" and if those of that order had all been endowed with the spirit and courage of archbishop Boyd, they never could have elevated this novelty over the ancient order, which extends to the ends of the earth. The 29th canon of the council of Chalcedon, which was the fourth general council, declares, "that to reduce a bishop to the degree or order of a presbyter, is sacrilege." "What troubles," says Spottiswood, "hereupon arose, both in the church and country, we shall hereafter hear."

In the fury of his barbarous zeal for the extirpation of episcopacy, Andrew Melville persuaded the magistrates of Glasgow to pull down their beautiful cathedral, which had miraculously escaped the desolating march of destruction during the first reformation. But the Glasgow tradesmen covered themselves with immortal honour, for they collected for the defence of their bishop's cathedral; and when the workmen were about to commence the work of demolition, they swore that the man who should cast down the first stone of it should be buried under it. This being reported to the young prince, not then fourteen years of age, he highly applauded the tradesmen's spirit and resolution, adding, "that too many churches had been already destroyed; he would therefore tolerate no more abuses of that kind[2]." Strange to say, the ministers were the promoters of this barbarous sacrilege, and were the plaintiffs in the action brought against the tradesmen, whom the prince protected, and inhibited the ministers from further proceedings.

1579.—In the month of June, queen Mary sent her private secretary, Mons. Noe, with a letter and a tender message to

[1] Spottiswood.—Calderwood. [2] Spottiswood, b. vi. 304.

her son, with some valuable jewels, and a vest embroidered with her own hand. The letter being addressed—"To our loving son James, prince of Scotland," Morton, who still retained considerable influence, though no longer regent, refused to admit the secretary to see the prince, or to deliver his letter and presents, because the queen had not honoured her son with the style and title of king, to which, during her life, he had no right; and Noc was dismissed in disgrace, to add one pang more to the accumulated afflictions of his mistress[1].

The General Assembly met at Edinburgh on the 7th of July; Thomas Smeaton was chosen moderator. The prince sent a letter to the Assembly by Duncanson his chaplain, wherein he signified his dislike of their former proceedings, and advised them to "abstain from making any novation in the church's policy, and to suffer things to continue in the present state till the meeting of parliament, and without prejudging the decision of the estates by their conclusions:" hinting also at the propriety of shewing more temper in their deliberations[2]. The Assembly voted this letter "harsh," and therefore it was thrown aside with contempt, and no attention was paid to its recommendation. The kirk was then too much occupied in seating "King Jesus on his throne," to heed what the kings of this world should command, in preservation of their own just prerogatives. So far were they from proceeding with caution and temper, that they summoned archbishop Adamson to answer to three several charges, viz.—for voting in parliament,—for giving collation of the vicarage of Bolton,—and for opposing the Second Book of Discipline, in his place in parliament. The presbyterian principles, which were now triumphant in the Assemblies, induced that body to assume to themselves the privilege of altering the fundamental laws of the kingdom, by prohibiting the bishops from sitting in parliament, whereas they were, and ever had been from the first parliament, the *first* of its estates—the lords temporal and the commons being the other two estates. Thus, in imitation of the Church of Rome, to which it cannot be denied that presbytery bears the strong resemblance of a child to a parent, they exercised a supremacy over both the crown and the parliament. This early exhibition of the natural insubordination of the disciples of Melville gave great offence at court, and, in consequence, the privy council reversed several of the Assembly's censures and excommunications; for the spiritual thunders of the Assem-

[1] Crawford's Memoirs.—Spottiswood, b. vi. 307.
[2] Spottiswood.—Calderwood.

bly had been as actively employed as those of the Vatican, and were certainly much more vexatious, because they were exercised on the most frivolous pretexts.

It must not be omitted here, that the first time a court of presbytery was heard of, which is the most specific, essential, and indispensable part of the presbyterian constitution, was in this Assembly. "Among the questions or articles proponed by the synod of Lothian, it was proponed that a general order be taken for erecting of presbyteries, in places where public exercise is used, until the time the policy of the kirk be established by law. It was answered, the exercise *may be* judged a presbytery[1]." This was to give a nimble turn to an occasional meeting of the ministers for friendly intercourse and mutual instruction, and which was called an *exercise*. But it was *not* a court, and had none of the requisites of one: for it had neither authority nor jurisdiction. It could neither enjoin penance on offenders, nor absolve them from it. It had not so much power as the meanest kirk-session, and had not the smallest resemblance to a presbytery. And the Assembly declaring it to be a court of presbytery, could not, with all their omnipotence, make it one retrospectively.

On the 8th September, lord Esmé Stewart, lord D'Aubigné, arrived at Leith, from France, to visit his cousin James. He was the son of John Stewart, brother of Matthew earl of Lennox James's grandfather, and so his first cousin. Charles VII. of France had conferred on his father the town and title of Aubigné, a town included in the province of Berry, but now in the department of Cher, seated in a fine plain on the river Nerre, and twenty-four miles from Bourges. This had always been an inheritance of the younger sons of the house of Lennox, since John Stewart defeated the English at the battle of Baugé, when he was made constable of France. James received his cousin with all the kindness which his affectionate temper prompted, and immediately made him a privy councillor, great chamberlain of Scotland, and duke of Lennox. The royal favour shewn to this interesting stranger immediately moved the envy of the nobility, and the jealousy of the ministers, who, with the uncharitableness of the age, loudly exclaimed that he had been sent by the French court to insinuate himself into James's confidence, which his rank and relationship would enable him easily to effect, and then to induce him to apostatise to popery, and to overthrow the protestant establishment[2]. The usurpation of the ministers incensed James, and was pro-

[1] Calderwood, p. 88.

[2] Balfour's Annals, i. 368-9.

ductive of much dissention between them, and many evils to both. Immediately that it was known that they were mutually struggling for power, multitudes of Jesuits and seminary priests came into the kingdom; and the depressed papists now became more courageous, and many of them made open confession of their faith. Mr. Nichol Burns, professor of philosophy in St. Leonard's college St. Andrews, and Messrs. Archibald and John Hamilton, regents of the New College, made open apostacy to popery. Many influential persons likewise made profession of the Roman Catholic religion; and a number of that communion assembled in Paisley, and sang *a soul's mass* in derision, for the eternal repose of the protestant church, which they now considered as nearly defunct. This alarmed and roused the ministers, who denounced from their pulpits the most dreadful anathemas on that "Roman antichrist," and even accused the prince of being a secret favourer of that church. James protested against this false accusation, and assured the furious ministers, that his cousin, the duke of Lennox, had renounced popery, on his earnest solicitation, and he commanded the Assembly to appoint any one of their number his chaplain. Accordingly, David Lindsay, minister of Leith, was, with the prince's approbation, placed in the duke's family, who brought him in a short time to make an open renunciation of the Roman tenets, in St. Giles's cathedral. Still this public confession did not remove the popular apprehensions, which were confirmed by an inundation of seminary priests and Jesuits from the continent, and, at the same time, dispensations from the pope were intercepted, "whereby *the papists were permitted to promise, swear, subscribe, and do what else should be required of them, so as in mind they continued firm, and did use their diligence to advance in secret the Roman faith.*" It is certain that James was a firm protestant, notwithstanding the many assertions to the contrary by the zealots of the times in which he lived, and the unjust calumnies which have since been heaped upon his memory. On being shown these dispensations, he immediately commanded John Craig, his chaplain, to draw up a short confession of faith, wherein all the errors of the Church of Rome, both in doctrine and rites, should be specially abjured; and in reference to these diabolical dispensations, a clause was inserted, whereby the subscribers called "God to witness, that in their mind and hearts they did fully agree to the said confession, and did not feign or dissemble in any sort." So desirous was the prince "to satisfy the kirk," that he subscribed and swore

to this confession in public, and his example was followed by his whole court, Lennox included[1].

On the 29th of October, James held a parliament at Edinburgh, wherein many good laws were enacted for the advancement of the gospel, the liberty of the kirk, and the prosperity of the kingdom; among which he gave his assent to an act of parliament, entituled "Wherein consists the jurisdiction of the kirk?"—"Our sovereign lord, with advice of his three estates of this present parliament, has declared and granted jurisdiction to the kirk, which consists and stands in the preaching of the word of Jesus Christ, correction of manners, and administration of the holy sacraments; and declares that there is no other face of a kirk, nor other face of religion, than is at present by the grace of God established within this realm, and that there is no other jurisdiction ecclesiastical acknowledged within this realm, other than that which is, and shall be, within the same kirk, or that which flows therefrom concerning the premises[2]."

The "face of a kirk" indicated in this act, was that titular episcopal church which was still the establishment of the kingdom, and had been so from the year 1560, and which this act shows that James and his parliament were determined to support and maintain. It was now rather more than five years, since Melville, the founder of presbytery in Scotland, first made his attack on episcopacy. It had kept its ground in spite of his utmost efforts, although he had pertinaciously continued to undermine it through ten successive Assemblies, without being able to remove it. Melville himself confesses, that the majority of the people, and the whole of the nobility, were vehemently opposed to his new scheme of presbytery; and in a letter to Beza he says,—"For five years we have now maintained a warfare against pseudo-episcopacy, many of the nobility resisting us, and we have not ceased to urge the adoption of a strict discipline. We have many of the peers against us; for they allege, if pseudo-episcopacy be taken away, one of the estates (of parliament) is pulled down." Calderwood, too, feelingly laments the impossibility of "reducing the titular bishops to the common order of ministers." Melville's admission to Beza of his underhand practices, shows that at the time when he was acting as principal of Glasgow University, and enjoying the hospitality of archbishop Boyd, he was se-

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 308-9.
[2] Stevenson's Coll. Acts Par. p. 16.—Balfour's Annals, i. p. 369.

cretly plotting the overthrow of that establishment in which he accepted office for its support. This concealment of his views shows that hypocrisy and partizanship had overmastered, for the time, the violence of his other passions and the ungovernable vehemence of his temper.

1580.—On the 12th day of July, the General Assembly met at Dundee, James Lawson moderator. Titular episcopacy had now subsisted full twenty years as the government of the kirk planted by Knox, and established by the parliament in 1560. But in this Assembly, the unremitting efforts of the father of Scottish presbytery were crowned with temporary success; and after so long struggling, and so many shifts and subterfuges, he at last procured an act of this Assembly to put down the episcopacy then subsisting, as *an unscriptural and an antichristian corruption*. In the fourth session the following act was passed:—

"Forasmuch as the office of a bishop, as it is now used, and commonly taken within this realm, hath no sure warrant, authority, nor good ground out of the book and scriptures of God, but is brought in by the folly and corruption of men's invention, to the great overthrow of the true kirk of God; the whole Assembly in one voice, after liberty given to all men to reason in the matter—none opposing themselves in defence of the said pretended office,—findeth and declareth the said pretended office, used and termed as is above said, unlawful in itself, as having neither foundation, ground, nor warrant, in the word of God; and ordaineth, that all such persons as bruik, or hereafter shall bruik the said office, be charged *simpliciter* to dimit, quit, and leave off the same, as an office whereunto they are not called by God: sicklike to desist and cease from preaching, ministration of the sacraments, or using any way the office of pastors, while they receive, *de novo*, admission from the General Assembly, under the pain of excommunication to be used against them; wherein if they be found disobedient, or contravene this act in any point, the sentence of excommunication, after due admonition, to be used against them[1]."

By this sweeping act, the "godly brethren" designed to overturn, not only that titular church which was then established, but also to strike at the root of episcopacy itself, as *antichristian* and unlawful. "In that they condemned the office of a bishop," says Calderwood, "as it was then used and commonly taken within this realm, they must not allow *any other sort of bishop*,

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 311.—Calderwood, p. 90.

either Anglican or Roman, but only the divine or apostolical bishop, who is only a pastor of a particular flock or congregation." The presbyterian party abrogated the established kirk on their own authority, and substituted their own polity in its place, without ever consulting the government; thus assuming the power of making laws for the kingdom, and constituting themselves a power superior to the sovereign and parliament. But this act carried both folly and iniquity on its face; for they peremptorily judged the office of a bishop to be unlawful, and required that those possessing office should be completely degraded, and admitted *de novo* to the ministry, as if they had not been ministers. This was done, too, by men who had no more pretensions to canonical orders themselves, than had the titular bishops whom they so unceremoniously dismissed from their offices. "But then, on the other hand," says the venerable Mr. Skinner, "what was that Assembly which so peremptorily and magisterially exauctorated and condemned this pretended episcopacy? Some assemblies might have done so upon good grounds, and by sufficient authority; but what gave this convention that authority, or what warrant from the word of God could they produce for their own office and titles, any more than the pretended titular bishops could produce for theirs? Or did they think it more unlawful and without warrant to assume the name and office of bishops, than of presbyters or ministers? However, with or without authority, the act passed, and that building which our reformers had with much labour been rearing for twenty years, was now thrown down by one bold stroke, and in its place was set up the equally unwarrantable idol of Genevan parity, which, under the name of the presbyterian kirk, has made a figure among us ever since."

Till this year, the presbyterian form of church government had no imaginable place in the Scottish reformation; for Knox was not a presbyterian. He settled the government in superintendents, ministers, and readers; and this order continued to be the fixed and established constitution for fifteen years, without ever having been called in question,—"its very form," as Spottiswood says, "purchasing it respect," till Andrew Melville,—the father and founder of Scottish presbyterianism, and a layman without any ordination, commenced his attack in 1575, and now in this year, and through ten successive Assemblies, accomplished the introduction of the presbyterian form of government by this memorable act; which, according to the declaration of the council of Chalcedon, was sacrilege. This Assembly assumed the whole powers of sove-

reiguty. It cnanged the establishment of the kingdom without consulting either the king or the parliament, and erected in its place a system of parity among the ministers, which effectually removed one of the estates of parliament. But even this equality among ministers, which is a system entirely of human invention, and is such an idol with all denominations of presbyterians does not entirely subsist, and is in practice altogether impracticable; for in every court, even in a parish kirk-session, there is a moderator or president, who is superior to his brethren present for the time being. A distinction of rank and office also is made between what is called a preaching and a ruling elder; and some of the church courts are superior to others. If it was such a very difficult matter as the first fathers of the presbyterian system found it, to subvert even the powerless titular prelacy that subsisted in the little kingdom of Scotland, and which held no canonical orders or apostolical succession, how much more difficult must it have been for the episcopal order to have usurped (if they did usurp), authority and jurisdiction over the order of presbyters throughout the whole world; and to do it so universally and imperceptibly, too, that no presbyter ever protested against it, and no historian whatever has ever recorded the event, or the measures resorted to, to secure their dominion? That episcopacy, therefore, should be the only ecclesiastical government wherever the gospel was preached, and that the church should universally submit to this government without the least recorded opposition, cannot be accounted for in any other way than that the gospel and the episcopate are coeval and of the same divine institution, and that episcopacy is the government to which Christ's gracious promise of perpetuity was made: but although very powerful enemies have endeavoured to extirpate it, yet it has subsisted from the beginning of christianity to this day without diminution.

We may here cite the opinion of Chillingworth, who is esteemed an authority by presbyterians of the present day. He sets out with asserting, "That seeing episcopal government is confessedly so ancient and so catholic, it cannot with reason be denied to be apostolic. For so great a change as between presbyterial government and episcopal could not possibly have prevailed all the world over in a little time. Had episcopal government been an aberration from, or a corruption of, the government left in the churches by the apostles, it had been very strange that it should have been received in any one church so suddenly, or that it should have prevailed in all for many ages after. Had the churches *erred*, they would have

varied; what, therefore, is the one and the same amongst *all*, came not sure by *error*, but by *tradition*. Thus Tertullian argues, from the consent of the churches of his time, not long after the apostles, and that in a matter of opinion much more subject to unobserved alteration. But that in the frame and substance of the necessary government of the church, a thing always in use and practice, there should be so sudden a change as presently after the apostles' times, and so universal as to be received in all the churches, this is clearly impossible. For what universal cause can be assigned or feigned of this universal apostacy? You will not imagine that the apostles all, or any of them, made any decree for this change when they were living, or left any order for it in any will or testament when they were dying. This were to grant the question, *to wit*, that the apostles being to leave the government of the churches themselves, and, either seeing by experience, or foreseeing by the Spirit of God, the distractions and disorders which would arise from a multitude of equals, substituted episcopal government instead of their own. General councils to make a law for a general change, for many ages there were none. There was no christian emperor, no coercive power over the church to enforce it; or if there had been any, we know no force was equal to the courage of the christians of those times. Their lives were then at command (for they had not then learned to *fight* for Christ); but their obedience to any thing against his law was not to be commanded (for they had perfectly learned to die for him); therefore there was no power then to command this change, or, if there had been any, it had been in vain. . . . . When I shall see, therefore, all the fables in the metamorphosis acted, and prove true stories; when I shall see all the democracies and aristocracies in the world lie down and sleep, and awake into monarchies, then I will begin to believe that presbyterial government, having continued in the church during the apostles' times, *should presently after*, against the apostles' doctrine and the will of Christ, be whirled about like a scene in a mask, and transformed into episcopacy. In the meantime, while these things remain thus incredible, and in human reason impossible, I hope I shall have reason to conclude thus:—Episcopal government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the church presently after the apostles' times. Between the apostles' times and this presently after, there was not time enough, nor possibility of so great an alteration. And therefore EPISCOPACY, being confessed to be so ancient and catholic, may be granted also to be APOSTOLICAL."

The confusions, troubles, and strifes which the Melvillian

principles brought into the church, and the seditions and rebellions which they produced in the state, were unceasing. James, who was a man of unquestionable talents and abilities, was so disgusted with the intractable, pragmatical spirit of a multitude of petty infallible popes, that he was obliged to restore the old titular episcopacy that had been set up by Knox in the commencement of the reformation. He had never, however, consented to the Assembly's abrogation of it, and he soon became convinced, after a few years' trial of presbytery, of the truth of his own maxim, "no bishop no king." This great and wise prince, who lived in the times when presbytery was first introduced, and who, it will readily be acknowledged, was a sufficient judge of passing events, affirms in his Basilican Doron, "that the learned, grave, and honest men of the ministry were ever ashamed of, and offended with, the temerity and presumption of the democratical and presbyterian party."

From the first dawn of the reformation, a Book of Common Prayer had been in constant use; at first that of Edward VI., afterwards one compiled, or at least sanctioned, by John Knox, and which had been in daily use up to the period of this Assembly. In Knox's Prayer Book there were not only set forms for the administration of the sacraments and holy offices, but also distinct and several forms for the ordination of superintendents, presbyters, and deacons, or readers, as he chose to call the last named office, with questions and responses, similar to the English Book of Ordination. This is one more of the many incidental evidences that were constantly occurring throughout the public transactions of those times, that Knox intended superintendents to be a distinct and superior order to presbyters, from the fact of his appointing a distinct form for their ordination. Mr. Cumming, in his recent republication of Knox's Prayer Book, has given only the form of the order for superintendents, having suppressed the others; and has added a note, to mislead his readers, stating that the superintendents were responsible to the presbyteries; whereas we have seen that there were no presbyteries in existence in Knox's time; and that the superintendents had both episcopal power and jurisdiction. Readers answered to the order of deacons, and were appointed by Knox to read the prayers in those situations where "gifted brethren" had not been placed, and who might "purchase for themselves a good degree," by being advanced to a higher office. This humble appendage of superintendency was now, however, to be visited with the besom of reforming zeal, "as being," says Calderwood, "no ordinary

office within the kirk of God[1]." The Common Prayers were henceforth to be discontinued, and extemporary worship to be adopted. The credulous people were now made to believe that the minister's extempore prayers were immediately dictated by the Holy Spirit; but in that case there would at least have been unanimity in them, and they should have been recorded for the use of the church. And truly, if the Holy Spirit could dictate heresies, treasons, rebellions, and contempt of ecclesiastical authority, the ministers of those days had a most abundant out-pouring of the spirit; indeed, they may be said to have had it without measure, and the unhappy fruits corresponded. But it is much more probable that the Holy Spirit had been grieved, and had withdrawn from them; for the works of the *flesh* were by far the most predominant: "idolatry, witchcraft[2], hatred, variance, emulations, wraths, strifes, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like[3]." Our Lord's Prayer, which is the rule of our desires, was discontinued, and condemned "as a papistical charm." The use of the hymn of praise called the Doxology, or "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost," was also abolished. This hymn, which is the divine song sung by the whole company of heaven[4], had always since the reformation been used after the psalms; and a story is told of a congregation in the county of Angus, who, not knowing of its discontinuance, began singing the doxology as usual, when they were interrupted by their minister, who exclaimed to the astonished people, "No more glory to the Father." They struck even at the root of christianity itself, by denying the scriptural authority of the Apostles' Creed, and, indeed, that idea has been since so far improved upon, that the Creed is not in the Westminster Confession of Faith, but is only inserted as a postscript at the end of the Shorter Catechism, with an apology for placing it even there; because, say the compilers, "there is no necessity for inserting the Creed[5]."

On the 20th of October, the General Assembly met again this year at Edinburgh, wherein the bishops were subjected to the persecutions of the presbyterian party, which was now

[1] Calderwood, p. 91.

[2] Many poor old women were burnt alive for witchcraft; formerly at one of these auto-da-fés, Knox presided and ecclesiastically condemned the so-called witch.

[3] Gal. v. 20. [4] Isaiah vi. 1—5—Revel. iv. 8.

[5] West. Conf. of Faith, and Shorter Catechism. Yet it was reported in the morning and evening prayers, and in the baptismal office of Knox's liturgy. Vide Cumming's Edition, pp. 15 and 63.

dominant. Thomas Cranstoun, minister of Inverleithen, was publicly rebuked for having administered the communion on Easter-day, and for having baptized privately. Acts of Assembly were passed for subjecting the bishops to the capricious despotism of those ministers over whom they had formerly exercised episcopal jurisdiction. The march of reformation was rapidly proceeding; and the presbyterian party had succeeded in casting themselves loose from all authority. As yet, however, they had not substituted any other form of government in place of the titular episcopacy, which still subsisted by law; for it was abolished only by the self-assumed authority of the Assembly, without consulting the sovereign and estates of parliament. During the last six years that the new policy of the kirk had been under discussion, not a word was said respecting that fundamental and indispensable part of the presbyterian system; and from which, indeed, it takes its name—the COURT OF PRESBYTERY. But as episcopacy was now voted tyranny and an antichristian corruption, it became necessary to produce a substitute for it, and this Assembly accordingly gave a commission to the laird of Dun (that is, the superintendent of Angus), Messrs. Pont, Lawson, Lindsay, Craig, and Duncanson, to be assisted by the Clerk of Register, by which they still showed their predilection for erastianism, or any three or four of them, *to devise a* PLOT OF THE PRESBYTERIES *and* CONSTITUTION *of the same; as seemeth best in their judgments, to be reported again to the next General Assembly*[1]."

A PRESBYTERY is one of the most specific, essential, and indispensable parts of the presbyterian constitution. Provincial synods can only meet twice, and the General Assembly now only meets once, in the year. The Commission of the Assembly is but an accidental thing, so recently erected as 1642; and it is not known to the law. The sudden dissolution of an Assembly may prevent its very existence; as it happened when the Assembly was dissolved by royal authority, in the year 1692, and did not again meet for several years. But a Presbytery *is a constant current court:* the members meet when they will, sit while they will; adjourn whither, how long, how short time soever, they will, and they have all the substantial power of government and discipline. They have really a legislative power, for they can make acts to bind themselves and all those who live within their jurisdiction; and they have a very large share of executive power. They can examine, ordain, admit, suspend, and depose

[1] Calderwood, p. 93.

ministers; they can cite, judge, absolve, condemn, and excommunicate whatsoever criminals. The supreme power of the kirk is *radically* and *originally* in them. General Assemblies possess power only *derivatively*, and as they *represent* all the presbyteries in the nation; and if a General Assembly should enact any law which the majority of the presbyteries should reprobate, it would not be obligatory. Nevertheless, how necessary, how useful, how powerful soever these courts are,—though they are essential parts of the constitution,—though they may be really said to be that which specifies presbyterian government,—*a presbytery was never in existence, was never heard of*, till the year 1580, *twenty years after* the reformation was settled by Knox, and established by act of parliament in the year 1560[1], when a committee of this Assembly was appointed to "*devise a plot of the presbyteries!*" Without any such intention, the First Book of Discipline undesignedly gave a plausible excuse for presbyteries, by appointing, while so many men of inferior talents and no education had thrust themselves into the ministry, that "the country ministers and readers should meet upon a certain day of the week in such towns, within six miles, as had schools, and to which there was repair of learned men, *to EXERCISE themselves in the INTERPRETATION of Scripture*." This was a very necessary and useful meeting for the times, and for the purpose expressed; but this meeting *was NOT a presbytery*, in the Melvillian sense of the term. It had no authority or jurisdiction, nor any power of coercion, over even its own members; it could neither enact nor execute laws; in short, it was simply a *debating society*, rendered necessary by the ignorance and inexperience of the new ministry. It served, however, for a nucleus for the new presbyteries, and advantage of its existence was adroitly taken by the Melvillians, to declare, in the Assembly of 1579, that "*the exercise was a presbytery*."

Notwithstanding the omnipotence of a modern presbytery, its members,—that is, the ministers within its jurisdiction or bounds, obey its decisions only when it suits their own convenience, which is the natural consequence of breaking loose from the ancient order and discipline. If the presbytery cite a minister to their bar, and he is condemned, he probably disdains to submit, and appeals to the synod, which is a superior court of review, which meets twice a year; and it may happen, as it does very often, to reverse the judgment of the presbytery. In that case the offender gains a triumph over the

[1] Fund. Ch. of Presbytery, 265.

presbytery, of which he is himself a member; but, if he should be condemned there also, then he sets the sentence of both courts at defiance, and appeals to the General Assembly, the court of last resort, which is now convocated only once a year. A great portion of its members are lay-elders, who are generally lawyers, men well versed in the art of special pleading,—and who are now, in point of fact, the *governors* of the presbyterian church. From this court the case is often remitted back to the presbytery for reconsideration, which hangs it up for another year; and in the end it is perhaps dismissed without any final judgment, both parties tiring of litigation, and the whole affair ending just where it began.

God the Holy Spirit had then evidently withdrawn from the kirk and the nation of Scotland, and given them both over to a reprobate mind. The factious ministers had decreed that episcopacy which is of divine institution, and without which there is no church, was an antichristian corruption, and thus, in fact, they excommunicated themselves by their own act from the whole visible church. St. Basil says, that it was the opinion of the universal church of his age, and a known and uncontested principle, "that the communication of the Holy Spirit *ceases* where the succession (of the bishops) is broken." One error naturally produced others. The "godly brethren" abolished all set forms of prayer, but above all that most perfect form which our blessed Lord gave as a sacred legacy to his church, and to be the rule of our desires, without which, it is to be feared, our prayers will not be acceptable. They resolved also "that no more glory should be given to the Father;" and set aside the Apostles' Creed, which is the rule of our faith. They next condemned private baptism, and the celebration of the holy communion on festival days, as superstitious and idolatrous, although such had been the practice in the Knoxian church. The presbyterians now utterly condemned the religious and grateful commemoration of our Saviour's nativity and circumcision, baptism, fasting, and temptation; his agony and bloody sweat, his precious death and burial, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, and the sending down of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, or, as it is now called, Whitsunday. The very Jews religiously observe the types and shadows of all the christian festivals; and their reverence for the priesthood is so great, that they have now *no animal sacrifices*, because they have lost the succession of their high priesthood, which was hereditary in the family of Aaron, and they will not incur the guilt of Korah by

assuming it. They discharged the repetition of the commandments, which are the rule of our obedience, from the public worship,—an omission which, among other things, no doubt tended to increase the public and private wickedness into which the nation fell. There can, however, be no farther occasion for commandments, since the promulgation of that presumptuous delusion, the doctrine of "the eternal decree;" for if a man has been predestinated, millions of years previous to his existence, to be either "elect" or "reprobate," without any effort on his part, to keep the commandments can be of no use. They must be a solemn mockery; and to discharge them from public worship is perfectly consistent with the doctrine of predestination. But these changes had a most injurious effect on the people, for it set them loose from all belief, since so many points which they had formerly believed were now condemned as antichristian and unlawful; and being now tossed about with every wind of doctrine, and led, or rather driven, by the cunning craftiness of such blind guides, they fell into the slough of heresy and schism, and esteemed submission to the powers that be, which God has commanded, to be sinful and unlawful.

The year 1580 will ever be memorable in Scottish annals, for the ecclesiastical revolution which produced the following important changes:—

1st, The titular episcopacy, under the name of superintendents, which Knox introduced, and the convention of estates established, in the year 1560, and again confirmed by the urgent desire of the General Assembly in 1572, was this year abrogated and condemned by the General Assembly *as an antichristian corruption*.—2d, The presbyterian form of government was, for the *first* time, introduced by the Assembly, but vigorously opposed by the prince, and many of the bishops and ministers.—3d, The office of reader, and the use of set forms of prayer, were discontinued; the first, "as no ordinary office within the kirk of God," and the latter, as "a papistical charm."[1]—4th, "*A plot of the presbyteries*" *was first devised*, there having been *no such court in existence* in this kingdom till Melville, and the reformers of his mind, "devised a plot," in this year, 1580.

Calderwood has recorded a set of propositions to which he has appended archbishop Adamson's signature, countersigned by A. Melville; and perhaps it is the paper which his perse-

[1] Calderwood.

cutors declare that he signed on his death-bed. But upon that solemn occasion, when it was shown to him, he *utterly denied, on the faith of a dying man, that ever he had signed or countenanced such a document.* The party were quite capable of such an imposition; but as Adamson was a vigorous and uncompromising opponent, and a strenuous defender of his titular episcopacy, it appears highly improbable that he would ever, in his sound senses, have signed a document which exhibits such a profound ignorance of true antiquity. But even granting that he had signed these propositions, the lawfulness and divine origin of episcopacy does not rest upon his opinions.

"I have thought good," says Calderwood, "to set down here some propositions subscribed and agreed unto by Mr. Patrick Adamson, when the Book of Policy was in framing."

"Unto the presbytery appertaineth all the ordinary power of judgment in matters ecclesiastical; to wit—

1st, In removing of slanders, as well in doctrine as in manners.

2nd, In electing worthy persons, and deposing the unworthy.

3rd, In expounding the constitutions of the kirk, which are taken out of God's word; and concerning these constitutions, which, in respect of the variety of circumstances, may be changed, it hath power in appointing or abrogating them.

Unto the presbytery properly appertaineth the extirpation or rooting out of heresies, the interpretation of the word, the censure of manners, monition, exhortations; yea, the judgment of excommunication appertaineth to the presbytery; sielike the election, deposing, correction, discharging, suspending, or interdicting of ministers; the explication of all ecclesiastical ordinances or constitutions, substantial or accidental, permanent or changeable, mutable or immutable, pertaineth to the presbytery.

Under the name of presbytery we understand pastors, doctors, and those who are properly called elders, guiders, leaders, whose office is to rule the kirk of God.

The power and authority of all pastors are equal and alike great among themselves.

The name of bishop is relative to the flock, and not to the eldership, for he is bishop of his flock, and not of other pastors or fellow-elders: as for the pre-eminence that one

beareth over the rest, it is the invention of man, and not the institution of holy writ.

(Signed) P. ADAMSON.
A. MELVINUS."

1581.—On the 28th January, James renewed the negative confession, under the name of a national covenant; and it was subscribed by the nobility and the great bulk of the nation. "In this confession," says Calderwood, "under the name of hierarchy, is condemned episcopal government. The Council of Trent thundered anathema against those who would not acknowledge that there is in the catholic kirk an hierarchy instituted by divine ordinance, consisting of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. This is that hierarchy of the Roman antichrist which is here condemned. When in the Confession of Faith we profess that we abhor and detest all particular heads, as they are now damned by the word of God and kirk of Scotland, do we not protest that we detest and abhor episcopal government, which was damned, not only by doctrine in pulpits, but also by acts of the Assemblies and articles of the Book of Policy? The discipline to be maintained by this confession is not the episcopal government, but the jurisdiction of kirk-sessions, presbyteries, synodal assemblies and general, agreed upon before, when the Book of Policy was approved in the Assembly."[1]

The author above cited is manifestly mistaken when he alleges that episcopacy was "damned by the word of God and kirk of Scotland," in this Confession. James and his council condemned "the pope's wicked hierarchy,"—that is, the hierarchy depending on the pope as its head; but James certainly did not mean protestant episcopacy, for he and his council that same year ratified and confirmed the agreement or concordat of Leith of the year 1572, which agreement was, without any doubt, in favour of the titular episcopacy then existing. Now, if the prince who imposed this confession had meant to condemn episcopacy generally, it is not probable that he would have ratified the Leith agreement in support of episcopacy, within the same year in which he is supposed to have condemned it, or, if he meant episcopacy generally by "the pope's wicked hierarchy," he must also have condemned ministers and deacons as well, because the Council of Trent has determined that presbyters and deacons are parts of their hierarchy as well as bishops; and therefore, by this confes-

[1] Calderwood, 96.

sion, he condemned the presbyterian discipline also, which I suppose, no true presbyterian will allow. The discipline alluded to in the negative confession cannot mean the presbyterian government, for when James first commanded his chaplain to draw it up, the "plot of the presbyteries" had not been settled, or even projected. The titular episcopacy was then still in existence; and, as a decided proof that the episcopal discipline was intended by the prince, he ratified and confirmed the Leith agreement, which was, that "those who were to have the office and power should also have the names and titles of archbishops and bishops."

In April a General Assembly met at Glasgow, when an objection was taken to the Dundee act, especially to the assertion that *the office of a bishop had no warrant in the word of God;* on which the Assembly declared that the meaning of that act was, to condemn the estate of bishops, *only as they were then in Scotland.* This may have been the construction which the majority of the Assembly put on the act of the former Assembly; but it certainly was not the meaning in which Melville had procured the act to be passed. The office of bishop, as it was then exercised, was a perfect anomaly, as the bishops had no apostolical descent or canonical consecration, being entirely the Erastian creation of the state. Nevertheless, as James came to better information, these lay-bishops would have acquired the true character of christian bishops, as their successors did on his auspicious accession to the throne of England. Melville undoubtedly intended to condemn the whole episcopal regimen of the christian church; and Calderwood says of this very case, "do we not protest that we DETEST and ABHOR EPISCOPAL GOVERNMENT, which was damned not only by doctrine in pulpits, but also by acts of Assemblies, and articles of the Book of Policy?[1] Much opposition was made by "the more wise and moderate," that this condemnation might be for some time at least deferred, "but they were cried down by the multitude[2];" amongst whom the most vociferous was MR. ROBERT MONTGOMERY, minister of Stirling, who urged the Assembly to censure those who had spoken in favour of that corrupted estate. Yet, before the end of that same year, this zealous presbyterian "did suffer himself to be more pitifully corrupted," by accepting the see of Glasgow, upon condition of making an assignation of its lands and revenues to the duke of Lennox. On his agreeing to this disgraceful con-

[1] Calderwood, 96. [2] Spottiswood, b. vi. 316.

dition, he was appointed to the archbishopric, and gave a bond "that how soon he was admitted bishop, he should dispone the lands, lordships, and whatsoever belonged to that prelacy, to the duke and his heirs, for the yearly payment of one thousand pounds Scots, with some horse-corn, and poultry." This vile Simoniacal bargain very justly excited against him universal indignation; but the Assembly overlooked this transaction, and charged him simply with the crime of accepting the bishopric. James, however, would not acknowledge this as a sufficient objection. "If they would charge him," said he, "with any fault in doctrine or life, he was content they should keep their order; but to challenge him for accepting the bishopric, he would not permit the same, *having lately ratified the act agreed upon at Leith, anno* 1572. *touching the admission of bishops*, and ordained the same to *stand in force* till his perfect age, or till a change thereof was made in parliament[1]." The prince's answer being reported to the Assembly, they cited Montgomery, that if it were possible, by severely cross questioning him, they might discover any thing in his life and doctrine on which to found an accusation. Andrew Melville became his public accuser, when fourteen articles were exhibited against him. Under such a prosecutor, condemnation followed as a matter of course, and he was commanded to continue in his ministry at Stirling, and meddle no more with the bishopric, on pain of excommunication; and in the meantime they suspended him from his ministry. He declined to submit to either of these sentences, and sheltered himself under the protection of the king and the duke; they therefore cited him to appear at the bar of the synod of Lothian, to hear the sentence of excommunication pronounced against him. This step moved the king to interpose the royal authority; and he commanded the synod to appear before him at Stirling, and to desist from all further process. Pont and some others presented themselves before James, but not without the following protest:—"That though they had appeared to testify their obedience to his majesty's warrant, yet they did not acknowledge the king and council to be competent judges in this matter; and therefore that nothing done at that time should either prejudge the liberties of the church or the laws of the realm." Notwithstanding this protest, the king peremptorily prohibited them from all further proceedings.

The *first* presbytery that ever was in existence in Scotland

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 316-17.

was erected in Edinburgh on the 30th of May this year. It consisted of sixteen members of the city and adjacent parishes, and of some barons and gentlemen out of each, as lay elders. And, "because presbyteries were not yet established every where, the Assembly nominated some brethren to travel to that effect, between and next Assembly[1]." Nevertheless, the "plots" for presbyteries were not agreed to till 1586, five years after this, nor ratified by parliament till the year 1592; so that it amounts to a demonstration that our first reformers were not presbyterians. "Could they be presbyterians who never understood, never thought of, never dreamt of, that which is so *essential to the constitution* of the presbyterian church, by divine institution?" At this period there were nine hundred and twenty-four parishes in the kingdom, which the Assembly thought proper to reduce to six hundred, and ordained each of these reduced parishes to have a minister, whose stipends were to be modified according to circumstances. These parishes were divided into fifty presbyteries, of twelve parishes in each[2]. It is supposed that before the reformation there were fully 2000 parishes in the kingdom, each of which was duly supplied with a resident priest. The avaricious designs of Morton, however, reduced them to 924; and the "desolating revolt" of presbytery again reduced them to *six hundred*. Hence one of the causes of the immorality and irreverence for sacred things, of the Scottish church and nation, after the reformation.

On the 1st June, the late regent, the earl of Morton, received the just reward of his many treasons, murders, robberies, sacrileges, and inhuman cruelties. He was accused before the privy council of having concealed the murder of the late king; he was tried, found guilty by a jury of his peers, and executed the following day on the High Street; but he asserted the queen's *innocence* in that horrid tragedy. So detested was he by those over whom he had formerly tyrannised, that his body lay from noon to sunset on the scaffold, covered with a beggarly cloak, till some low fellows interred it in the common burial ground, without any funeral ceremony. His head was afterwards fixed on the jail[3]. Morton's character was very bad, and his practices on the church were of the most injurious and lasting mischief. But Spottiswood, who invariably inclines to the side of

[1] Calderwood, 116.
[2] Calderwood, 117.
[3] Calderwood.—Spottiswood.—Balfour's Annals. i. 373.

charity, says of him, "Never was seen a more notable example of fortune's mutability: he who a few years before had been reverenced of all men, and feared as a king, abounding in wealth, honour, and number of friends and followers, was now at his end forsaken of all, and made the very scorn of fortune; to teach men how little stability there is in honour, wealth, friendship, and the rest of these worldly things which men so much admire. He was of a personage comely, of middle stature, and a graceful countenance, whereof, in the civil troubles, he gave many proofs; wise and able for government, a lover of justice, order, and policy; *but inclined to covetousness*, which the wants and necessities he endured in his younger years was thought to have caused, and given too much to the pleasures of the flesh, as at his dying he acknowledged with a great remorse. In this, lastly, most happy, that though his death in the world's eye was shameful and violent, yet did he take it most patiently, quitting this life with the assurance of a better[1]."

In the Assembly which met at Edinburgh on the 17th October, it was enacted, that no marriage be celebrated, nor sacraments ministered, in private houses; but solemnly, according to good order hitherto observed, under pain of deposition from the ministry. This ordinance was occasioned by the minister of Tranent having baptized an infant in a private house, and whom the Assembly suspended from his ministry[2].

After several angry messages betwixt the king and the Assembly, respecting Montgomery, and in opposition to the royal wishes, the Assembly ordained the synod of Lothian to proceed against him, and charged him to continue in his ministry at Stirling, and desist from all aspirations for the see of Glasgow, under pain of excommunication. John Dury had accused the duke of Lennox, from the pulpit, with unsoundness in religion, of secret attachment to popery, and of corrupting and misleading the king. This he repeated several times, which so incensed the king that he ordered the provost to banish him from the city; who accordingly *advised* him to depart. But Dury fled to the sanctuary of the church, and refused to go unless with the Assembly's permission: this was of course refused, and the civil power forced him to remove from the city; but he was afterwards brought back in triumph by the brethren. The king's favourite was the butt for pulpit eloquence and

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 311-15-17. [2] Calderwood.

slander; and he was next assaulted by Mr. Walter Balcanqual, who asserted, in one of his sermons, "that popery had entered into the court and country, and was maintained in the king's hall by the tyranny of a great champion who was called Grace; but that if his grace continued to oppose himself to God and his word, he should come to little grace in the end." The king ordered the Assembly to take cognizance of this; but that body informed the king that they could not warrantably proceed against Balcanquhal, unless at the instance of some accuser supported by credible witnesses. The king dropped the matter; but Balcanquhal was not disposed to rest satisfied simply with victory; he desired a triumph. He appealed to the Assembly, who voted his doctrine to be orthodox, and the accusation of the duke to be just[1]. Before the rising of this Assembly it was enacted that, "Because presbyteries were not as yet established everywhere, the Assembly nominated some brethren to travel to that effect between this and the next Assembly." This Assembly recognised erastianism, by acknowledging that the Confession of Faith which was set forth by his majesty, with the advice of his council, was a godly and christian confession, and charged all ministers to compel their parishioners to sign it, under pain of their own deprivation in case of their neglect, and of the people's excommunication in the event of their refusal[2].

1582.—On the 8th March, Montgomery, the new archbishop, went to Glasgow, accompanied by a guard, to take possession of his see. It being Sunday, and the minister engaged in the pulpit, Montgomery pulled him by the sleeve, saying, "Come down, sirrah!"—"I am placed here by the Kirk," replied the minister, "and will give place to none intruding himself without order." The people prevented farther altercation; and after this disgraceful scene, the presbytery of Stirling suspended Montgomery: nevertheless he preached as formerly[3]. The prince warned the synod to meet at Stirling in April; and, in the meantime, he discharged all proceedings against Montgomery. Robert Pont protested that they did not acknowledge his majesty and council as judges in this cause, and that they had only appeared in order to testify their obedience. The council, however, rejected this protest.

The General Assembly met on the 24th April at St. Andrews, when they confirmed the suspension of Montgomery, and were proceeding to excommunicate him, when they were interrupted

[1] Heylin, lib. v. 193.—Spottiswood, b. vi. 317. [2] Calderwood, 120.
[3] Calderwood, p. 121.

by Mark Kerr, the master of the requests, who presented James's letter, inhibiting the Assembly from troubling the bishop, as he would have the cause heard and handled in his own presence. The Assembly would not yield to the prerogative; and Andrew Melville, the champion of Presbytery, who presided, replied, "That they did not meddle with things belonging to the civil power; and, for matters ecclesiastic, they were warranted to proceed in them, especially with one of their own number." And so determined were they, that the master of the requests was obliged to instruct a messenger-at-arms to charge them to desist under pain of rebellion[1]. The thunders of the Assembly, and the vexatious opposition he met with, subdued Montgomery's courage, and induced him to surrender the bishopric; nevertheless the duke retained the temporalities[2]. By this resignation he incurred James's displeasure; whereupon he renewed his attempt to take possession of his see, and had letters from James to the noblemen in that neighbourhood to give him all assistance. His intention was to preach; but the students of the university took possession of the cathedral on Saturday night, and placed Smeton, their principal, in the pulpit. Montgomery appeared at the ordinary hour, accompanied by a numerous retinue of the neighbouring gentry, when he forcibly displaced the preacher, and delivered a sermon himself. The ministers of Glasgow intended to have prosecuted the archbishop "for molestation of the church, and usurping the place of the ordinary preacher;" but the provost presented the king's warrant to stay all proceedings against the archbishop, and commanded them to desist. Mr. Howison, minister of Cambuslang, rudely refused, and uttered some contemptuous words; on which the provost pulled him out of his chair, and committed him to the common jail.

The last Assembly ordered a fast to be observed throughout the kingdom, "for abundance of sin, the oppression of the church, the dilapidation of the rents, and the danger wherein the king stood by the company of wicked persons, who did seek to corrupt him in manners and religion." To these public calamities was now added, "the insolency committed at Glasgow," which furnished the zealous ministers with a most excellent topic for declamation. John Davidson, minister of Libberton, pretending a warrant from the Assembly, took upon him to excommunicate Montgomery; which, though contrary to law, was allowed by the other ministers, and intimated in all the parishes of the kingdom. The Duke of Lennox disregarded

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 318.—Calderwood, 123. [2] Keith's Catalogue, 261.

this illegal excommunication, and entertained Montgomery as usual; whereupon two of the brethren were sent to warn the duke of the danger of entertaining an excommunicated person. The duke indignantly inquired of the brethren, "whether the king or the church were sovereign?" adding, that he was commanded by the king and council to entertain him, and which he would not forbear to do for any fear of their censures." Frustrated in their malicious design, the brethren determined on appealing to James, who then kept his court at Perth, and who proved a better casuist than they were; "for," said he, "the excommunication was null, and declared such by the council, as being pronounced against equity and all lawful form, no citation being used, nor any admonition preceding, which all laws, and even their own discipline, appointed to be observed[1]." Thus disappointed of wreaking their vengeance against Montgomery, Andrew Melville inveighed against the "*bloudie guillie*" of absolute authority, whereby many, he said, "intended to pull the crown off Christ's head, and to wring the sceptre out of his hand[2]."

On the 12th of August, James was made a state-prisoner in Ruthven Castle by his rebellious nobles. He then held his court at Falkland; and, being engaged in field sports, he was enticed, on the 23d of August, to Ruthven Castle, where he was at first respectfully entertained, but when he wished to depart he found himself a prisoner. The conspirators had, for their own safety, previously sent the Duke of Lennox to Edinburgh under a frivolous pretext. His imprisonment, and the apprehensions that such a step taken by such unscrupulous men might bring him to the same violent end as his father had experienced, made the young king shed tears. His natural fears, and consequent tears, drew no more pity nor respect from his ferocious though noble jailors than their contemptuous exclamation, that *it was fitter for boys to shed tears than for bearded men*. As soon as the Duke of Lennox heard of this audacious act of high treason, he despatched some noblemen to ascertain whether or not the king was either free or captive. James assured them he was captive, and commanded the duke to raise forces to redeem him; but on the other hand, the conspirators declared it was their intention to emancipate the king from the evil councils of the Duke of Lennox. They immediately afterwards compelled the king to issue a proclamation, as if he had been unconstrained, in which he is made to declare, "that he remained in that place of his own free will; that the nobility then

[1] Calderwood.—Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 319. [2] Calderwood, p. 129.

present had done nothing which they were not in duty obliged to do; that he took their repairing unto him for a service acceptable to himself, and profitable to the commonwealth; that, therefore, all manner of persons whatsoever who had levied any forces, under colour of his present restraint, should disband them within six hours, under pain of treason." Besides this proclamation, they compelled the royal captive to command the duke, who had collected some forces for the king's rescue, to depart the kingdom before the 20th of September. On receipt of the king's letter, the duke sought shelter within the impregnable battlements of Dumbarton Castle, to wait the issue of events. From Dumbarton, the duke passed through England, and went to France, "where, it was thought, he had got poison, by the lingering working of it, which procured his death in the month of May in the following year, 1583. After he came to France, neither the king of France, nor yet the nobility there, nay, nor his own lady, gave him any respect, in *that he had joined the Protestant religion, and communicated with them*[1]."

This conspiracy is commonly called the "Raid of Ruthven," and was contrived and executed with the foreknowledge and secret encouragement of the zealous Andrew Melville, and the Presbyterian ministers. Queen Elizabeth, also, had sent Sir George Cary and Robert Bowes as her ambassadors, under pretext of solicitude for James's personal safety, but in reality to countenance and support the traitors. The conspirators removed James to Holyrood House. The General Assembly, sympathising cordially with this conspiracy, which the ministers' sermons and factious conduct had tended so materially to foster, approved most heartily of this act of treason. And in one of their acts, they "exhorted all good subjects, as they tender the glory of God, and love the preservation of the king and country, faithfully *to concur and join with* the said noblemen; and if any should be found either by word maliciously, or violently by way of deed, *to oppose that good cause*, they shall be called before the particular elderships, and order put unto them by the censures of the church. And in case of their wilful and obstinate continuing therein, be delated to the king and council to be punished for their offence civilly[2]."

The Assembly met in Edinburgh on the 9th of October, and after framing and publishing the act, of which the foregoing is an excerpt, and which leaves an indelible memorial of the seditious spirit of resistance to government which actuated the

[1] Balfour's Ann. i. 374. [2] Calderwood.—Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 323.

presbyterian teachers of that time, they next proceeded to frame more "plots for presbyteries." These courts were now erected for the *first time* in Caithness, Sutherland, Ross, Moray, Aberdeen, and Banff. At the same time, commissions were issued to several presbyteries to summon the bishops before them, and to accuse them summarily of the following offences:—viz. of not preaching and administering the sacraments, of negligence of doctrine and discipline, haunting and frequenting the company of excommunicate persons, for giving scandal any way in life or conversation; with a long list of other equally frivolous offences, which were got up without any regard to truth or justice, for the purpose of persecuting and vexing the titular bishops, and compelling them to resign their offices[1].

On Friday, the 28th of September, George Buchanan, the king's preceptor, and his mother's libeller, died, aged seventy-six, and was buried, at the expense of the city of Edinburgh, in the Greyfriars' churchyard: "There," says Mr. Lawson, "to the disgrace of his country be it recorded, lies the most illustrious scholar Scotland ever produced, without a monument to mark the spot where his ashes repose." Buchanan was a great scholar; but he was tinctured with the worst republican principles, and was of a morose, spiteful, and vindictive disposition. He early attached himself to the party of the earl of Moray, whose ambition aimed at wearing the crown, and to whom Buchanan's literary superiority was of the utmost importance. He was an abject sycophant to queen Mary whilst she possessed power; but, on her fall from the royal estate, he turned against her with fiendish violence, and leagued himself with Moray and her enemies, and conducted her impeachment in the courts of an alien sovereign. He composed his false "Detection," which fortunately was written and published in Latin, so as to be beyond the vulgar reach; and he forged, and afterwards swore to the veracity of, a number of letters and sonnets, purporting to be in the queen's name, containing the most impure and indelicate allusions, and the most atrocious incentives to the murder of her unfortunate husband. To the son of this unhappy and ill-used queen he was appointed tutor, whom he treated neither with respect nor kindness, the remembrance of which, together with the pernicious maxims on government which he used every effort to disseminate, caused in his royal pupil a dislike which James ever manifested to Buchanan's memory. In his *Basilicon Doron* James gives his opinion freely on his tutor's writings and sentiments: "I

[1] Calderwood, p. 153.—Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 322.

would have you," says he, "to be well versed in authentic histories, and in the chronicles of all nations, but especially in our own histories, the example whereof most nearly concerns you. I mean not of such infamous invectives as Buchanan's or Knox's Chronicles; and if any of those infamous invectives remain until your days, use the law upon the keepers thereof; for in that point I would make you a pythagorist, to think that the very spirits of these *archibellowes of rebellion* have made transition in them that hoard their books, or maintain their opinions." In his book *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*, which was afterwards burnt by the hands of the common hangman at the market cross, Buchanan was the first who openly reduced rebellion and resistance to government to a system. Few men have ever indulged in such morose and vindictive passions as the royal tutor. A specimen of his keen hatred and round abuse is conspicuous in an epigram on the infamous murder of archbishop Hamilton, in which he says, "that our parent earth now breathes *lighter* since delivered from the *burden of such an abominable monster;* that all the angels of darkness have been fatigued in preparing for his reception; and that every department of perdition now stands still, the whole of Tartarus being devoted to *a single victim;* and concludes with expressing his regret that the primate's carcase had not been cast to the dogs." He was, however, an elegant Latin scholar, into which language he translated the Holy Psalms in verse unsurpassed for beauty or classical accuracy. He also published in Latin a history of his native country, which is pervaded by the same sentiments as his work *De Jure Regni*, and which he intended should serve the purposes of the faction to which he had attached himself. It is, however, but justice to the memory of this extraordinary man to say, it is positively asserted that on his death-bed he acknowledged the wrong he had done to his sovereign. It is contained in a letter from bishop Sage:—

"Sir,—About twenty-eight years ago I had occasion, at Mrs. Drummond's, of Invermay house, in Strathearn, to be in conversation with an ancient lady (the lady Rasyth, in Fife), a woman of very bright parts, and of very good principles. She was a daughter of the house of Buchanan. In the progress of our discourse we came to talk of the famous Mr. George Buchanan. I told her I had not long before read over Famianus Strada's book *De Bello Belgico*, and had found in it (I think *ad annum* 1586) an account of Mr. Buchanan's confession when on his death-bed, 'that he had been most injurious in papers

published by him, to queen Mary of Scots; wishing earnestly that God would allow him time and strength before he died to do her justice.' I added that the account was new to me (for I had not then seen Camden's Elizabeth), and that I was afraid Strada was partial, having many other things in his book too like romance, and that, therefore, I was not forward to believe him in that matter. The lady forthwith desired me to take her word for it, *that it was certain truth;* for she remembered nothing better than that, in her younger years, she had oftener than once heard a very aged man called David Buchanan, who was maintained in her father's family, affirm, '*that he was present in Mr. Buchanan's bedchamber, and an ear witness to that confession when he made it.*' This, so far as my memory serves me, is the substance of what I learned of that lady at that time. It made the deeper impression on me when I reflected on the time of Mr. Buchanan's death, which was in September 1582; at which time David Buchanan might have been very capable to consider what Mr. George said, though he had afterwards lived after the year 1630 or 1636: and about that time the lady was capable of receiving it from him.

(Signed) JOHN SAGE[1]."

1583.—A report of the raid of Ruthven having reached the court of France, the king sent Monsieurs De la Motte Fenelon, and Meneval (or Maningveil) as ambassadors, to endeavour to procure James's freedom, and to negociate with the captive queen for his recognition as king, as none of the foreign princes had ever yet recognized James's title to the throne of Scotland. The presbyterian teachers declaimed bitterly against the ambassadors, but more especially against De la Motte, who being a knight of the order of St. Esprit, wore a white cross on his shoulder. The ministers denounced this as the badge of antichrist; and the people, instigated by the preachers, openly insulted them in the streets, and called him the ambassador of the bloody murderer. In this state of things the ambassadors were desirous of returning to France, as they saw that the prince was quite unable either to protect them from insult, or to restrain the violent declamation of the ministers, "*who howled,*" says Robertson, a presbyterian writer, "*with a vehemence which no regular government would*

[1] Gillan's life of bishop Sage, which was printed in London in 1711. The letter is dated the 17th of October, 1709, and which his biographer importuned him to write, because he had frequently heard him relate the above, and also an anecdote respecting Alexander Henderson, which shall be given in its own place.

now tolerate, but which was then exceedingly common." The prince, desirous of preserving a friendly intercourse with France, and of showing respect to the ambassadors of that power, ordered the magistrates of Edinburgh to entertain them at a grand banquet. The king's commands, however, could not be obeyed without first consulting the city ministers; and they decidedly countermanded the king's order. The town council, however, thought it more prudent to comply, and a public dinner was accordingly prepared, at which, at that time, usually was given soon after mid-day. To interrupt and prevent this civic festival, the loyal and peace-making ministers ordained a fast to be strictly observed that same day on which the feast was appointed; and to detain the people at church, they commenced the service at nine o'clock in the morning; and three preachers, in quick succession, mounted the pulpit, and thundered out censures the whole day, without intermission, against the magistrates and those noblemen who, in obedience to James's commands, waited on the ambassadors. Neither did their malicious insubordination stop there, for they excommunicated the magistrates for not observing the fast, which they had so vexatiously and illegally appointed.[1] It cannot, therefore, excite any surprise, that, under such seditious and malignant teachers, the people were preached into the grand rebellion in the following reign. Since James's inthralment at Ruthven, the preachers knew no bounds to their licentiousness, for the conspirators courted their assistance; and Calderwood says that, after this, "liberty was renewed to the ministers to preach the word freely, to exercise discipline, and to hold ecclesiastical assemblies. Papists, Jesuits, excommunicate persons, licentious libertines, old enemies to this crown and the friendship standing between the two realms, either left the country and the court, or stooped in silence *with external reverence to the word.*" This licence the author of the "State and Sufferings of the Church of Scotland," calls—"having a little sunshine."

In this sunshine of the presbyterian supremacy, the crime of witchcraft was visited with condign punishment: a woman, named Alison Pearson, *suspected* of this crime, was tried and condemned by the presbytery of St. Andrews, and was afterwards delivered over to the secular arm, and burnt alive.

James effected his deliverance from the conspirators with considerable tact; and only admitted colonel Stewart, the commander of his guard, into his confidence. The king had been

[1] Calderwood, p. 138.—Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 324.

permitted to reside a short time at Falkland, to enjoy the pleasure of the chase, when he expressed a desire to visit his uncle, the earl of March, who then resided in the abbey of St. Andrews, which favour the conspirators also granted. After dinner he went to view the castle, into which he had no sooner entered, than Stewart, as previously arranged, shut and barricaded the gate, and entirely excluded the faction, who were following. As soon as it was known that the king had effected his deliverance from the conspirators, all the loyal nobility repaired to St. Andrews to congratulate his majesty, who soon found himself in sufficient strength to return in freedom to his capital, and thence to Perth. He there issued a proclamation, declaring the late restraint of his person to be a treasonable act; but he gave at the same time a free and general pardon to all the traitors who would acknowledge their guilt, and sue for it. In December following there was a convention of estates, in which the king's proclamation was approved and ratified, and the late conspiracy was declared to be *crimen læsæ majestatis*, or treason in the highest degree.

The General Assembly met at Edinburgh in October, and presented a long list of imaginary grievances to the prince, to which he returned a dignified answer, gently rebuking their meddling with affairs of state, and fostering needless jealousies. The king's answer might have satisfied reasonable men; but "the discontent which the ministers had received for the late change in the court, made every thing distasteful unto them, and still the displeasure betwixt the king and church did grow, as we shall hear." At this period the kingdom seems to have been in a fearful state of crime and irreligion, and the laws were neither obeyed nor executed. The newly-erected presbyteries signalised their entrance into life by persecuting the titular bishops, but especially Adamson, on the most vexatious and frivolous pretexts. The prosecution of old women for alleged witchcraft also occupied the attention of these new-made courts.[1]

1584.—The court was continually embroiled with the factious ministers, for seditious and treasonable passages in their sermons. They appear to have set themselves in opposition to the whole civil government, and to the most reasonable demands of the prince. They justified, and called the nation to approve of the treasonable raid of Ruthven as good service, and in their sermons they applauded the traitors as patriots. Many

[1] Calderwood, 111-13.—Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 327.

of the ministers who had manifested their approbation of the Ruthven conspiracy now pretended that they were suffering persecution for conscience sake, left their charges, and took shelter in England; and the other actors in that treason preferred seditious agitation rather than a peaceable life, notwithstanding the king's remarkable clemency. John Dury, in a sermon, publicly justified the Ruthven conspiracy; and being cited by the privy council, he there defended his seditious language; but the fear of consequences induced him to acknowledge his error. Andrew Melville, however, gave more trouble on the same score: he compared the present state of the nation with that under James III., and intimated that their supposititious grievances should be redressed in the same way; that is, by rebellion and the murder of the king. He declined the judgment of the king and council, and assumed one of the worst principles of the Romish church, "that what was spoken in the pulpit ought first to be tried and judged by the presbytery, and that neither the king nor council might, *in prima instantia*, meddle therewith, though the speeches were treasonable." Finding the man so obstinate and contumacious, and that no persuasion could induce him to yield, James proceeded to examine witnesses, when master Andrew brought "a railing accusation" against him, and conducted himself in an outrageously insolent manner. He told the king, with great assurance, that his majesty "perverted the laws both of God and man." This unchristian conduct gave great offence to the council, who forthwith charged him to enter his person a prisoner in Blackness Castle; but instead of obeying, he fled that night to Berwick, where he was protected by Elizabeth, who encouraged and fomented all the conspiracies and seditions in the kingdom. He was followed by some others of the seditious ministers, who, being ineffectually warned to render themselves up to the king and council, were denounced rebels. The pulpits resounded with declamatory accusations of the cruelty and tyranny of the court, and "that the light of the country for learning, and he who was only most fit to resist the adversaries of religion, was exiled, and compelled, for safety of his life, to quit the kingdom.[1]" Such factious conduct cannot, by any well-regulated mind, be esteemed religious; for "if any man seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain." James condescended to clear himself of the false accusations of the godly brethren by

[1] Calderwood, p. 111.—Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 330.

proclamation; but as the subject was one likely to rouse the vile passions of the mob, the brethren made no alteration in their inflammatory harangues, and Spottiswood feelingly remarks—"Pity it is to think how the king was then used." Having been promised support from Elizabeth's government, and also relying on the factious agitation of the ministers, the Ruthven conspirators still gave James's government considerable trouble. New commotions were beginning to disturb the king's peace, and the ministers sounded out sedition, as usual, from their pulpits. Some were imprisoned, and others were compelled to quit the kingdom. The earl of Gowrie remained behind, at large; but from some equivocal steps, suspicion falling on him, he was arrested at Dundee, brought to Edinburgh, tried and condemned for high treason, and beheaded in the month of April.

Parliament met for the despatch of business on the 22d of May. Adamson and Montgomery sat in it as the representatives of the first or spiritual estate in the name of the kirk. In it the prince's declaration of the Ruthven conspiracy was ratified; the king's authority over *all* persons, and in *all* causes, confirmed; the declining his majesty's judgment and the council's, in whatsoever matter, declared to be treason; the impugning the authority of the three estates, or procuring the innovation or diminution of the power of any of them, inhibited under the same pain. All jurisdictions and judicatures, spiritual or temporal, not approved of by his highness and the three estates, were discharged, and an ordinance made, "that none, of whatsoever function, quality, or degree, should presume, privately or publicly, *in sermons*, declamations, or familiar conferences, to utter any false, untrue, or slanderous speeches to the reproach of his majesty, his council and proceedings, or to the dishonour, hurt, or prejudice of his highness, his parents, or progenitors, or to meddle with the affairs of his highness and estate, under the pains contained in the acts of parliament made against the makers and reporters of lies[1]." The framing of such an act of parliament to curb the licentious insubordination of the first presbyterian ministers, is perhaps the strongest proof that can possibly be adduced of the incompatibility of their principles with civil government, and of their disobedience to that "evangel" which they so fervently preached. The Scripture says, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by Him for the

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 333.

punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well." Now, it must not be forgotten, that when these words of inspiration were written, Nero, a monster of cruelty and wickedness, and a heathen persecutor of the church, was the king as supreme. Lastly, an act was passed for calling in Buchanan's history, his master-piece of sedition, *De Jure Regni*, and his most infamous libel on the queen, called the *Detection*.

It was not likely that a factious body of intemperate ministers, who had been accustomed to censure and oppose all authority with the most unbounded licentiousness, would quietly submit to have their public importance thus circumscribed by an act of parliament, and a check to be placed on their inflammatory harangues. They were most especially unwilling to yield obedience to the prince's supremacy, to which they had all along maintained a constant and most factious opposition, and in many recent instances they had actually set it at defiance. Their alarm was proportionably great, and their complaints of what they called tyranny, but which was the effect of their own seditious conduct, were loud and clamorous. All the Edinburgh ministers, who were called the watch-tower of the nation, deserted their flocks with precipitation, and fled to England, and many of the country ministers followed their unchristian example. But the most daring opposition was offered by Robert Pont, minister of St. Cuthberts, who was at the same time a lord of session. When the heralds, according to custom, were proclaiming the new acts of parliament at the market-cross of Edinburgh, Pont solemnly protested against them in the name of the brethren, because they had been passed without the knowledge and *consent* of the church! To such a height did these zealous ministers carry the true spirit of popery in encroaching on the power and prerogatives of the crown; and thus, in fact, the General Assembly assumed the usurped powers of the Roman pontiff. But considering the close affinity of popery and presbytery, it is not surprising to find so many of their seemingly discordant principles corresponding so exactly. Although they had annihilated its spiritual estate, yet the ministers even went so far in their opposition as to declare acts of parliament passed without their consent to be illegal. Those ministers who had so lately deserted their duty, and fled into England, leaving their congregations, "without supply of sermon," wrote a letter to the kirk-session and town-council of Edinburgh, wherein they complained in the most bitter terms of the king and his counsellors, and charitably ascribed to them the whole of the miseries which

the unhappy kingdom suffered. The complicated miseries of the kingdom, in truth, were entirely owing to the spirit of resistance and rebellion which they themselves had preached and infused into the minds of the people, and which is the very opposite of religion; for the fruit of true religion and "of the Spirit, is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; against such there is no law[1]." When the prince heard of this letter, he directed the magistrates to return a sarcastic answer to the ministers, upbraiding them with their seditious conduct and cowardly desertion of their flocks. The letter called them "fugitives, rebels, and wolves," and recommended to them to study the thirteenth chapter of the Romans, which, says the letter, "*you did seldom exhort us to apply.*" These "fugitives" took the taunts contained in this letter so much to heart, that one of them, Lawson, sickened and died at London[2].

James laboured incessantly to induce the ministers to subscribe "certain articles" which required obedience to the bishops, and submission to the late acts of parliament. All who held the presbyterian principles refused subscription, and their stipends were, in consequence, sequestrated, which immediately produced a popular discontent, and favour for the rebel ministers: when the prince perceived this, he called the principal of them before him, and explained to them, that his whole desire was to have the church peaceably governed, and a decent polity established. He desired them to state their reasons in writing for their refusing subscription, that he might satisfy their scruples; but they preferred answering him verbally, when he prevailed on them to sign, after adding a clause to satisfy their scruples,—"agreeing with the word of God."

1585.—The whole of this year was occupied in disputes between "the sincerer sort" of the ministers and the prince's government; the "godly brethren" preached seditious sermons, justified and applauded the "raid of Ruthven," as "good service," but which the laws, when left to their own course, called *treason*, and for which the principal actor most justly lost his head. The prince used every effort to remove from the minds of his people a most unjust suspicion which the "sincerer sort" had excited, and of which they made a stalking-horse for factious purposes,—of his inclination to popery,—to which no man was less inclined; for they had themselves given him a surfeit of popery. But the flight of so many of

[1] Gal. v. 22, 23. [2] Spottiswood, b. vi. 333-4.—Calderwood, 151—159.

the ministers, and the enormous clamour which they excited in England against him, had encouraged a belief of his real disposition to that heresy. James, therefore, found himself obliged to issue a public manifesto in order to set himself right with both nations; in which he justified the passing of the acts of parliament, which had created so much clamour, on account of the Assembly having approved of the treason at Ruthven; Melville having declined the civil judicature; the insolent proclamation of a *fast*, at the moment when he had ordered a *feast* to the French ambassadors; the factious and seditious imposition of fasts by their own authority, and in defiance of the civil power; the usurpation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; the abrogation of the laws of the realm, and the enacting new ones at their own pleasure, without the consent or formality of parliament; and the drawing all causes to themselves, although purely of a civil or secular nature. On which account, he said, they compelled, by church censures, all men to submit to them who had been accused, acquitted by the court, or pardoned by the king, for murder, theft, or any other atrocious crimes. But all this, says Heylin, "could not stop the mouths, much less the pens, of that waspish sect; some flying out against the king in their scurrilous libels, bold pamphlets, and defamatory rhymes; others with no less violence inveighing against him in their pulpits, but most especially in England, where they were out of the king's reach, and consequently might rail on without fear of punishment. By them it was given out, to render the king odious both at home and abroad, that the king endeavoured to extinguish the light of the gospel, and to that end had caused those acts to pass against it: that he had left nothing of the whole form of justice and piety in the spiritual estate but a naked shadow: that popery was immediately to be established, if God and all good men came not in to help them: that for opposing these impieties they had been forced to flee their country, and sing the Lord's song in a strange land[1]."

In addition to this proclamation, James found it necessary, or political, to send an ambassador to the court of Elizabeth to remove the evil impression which the clamour of the fugitive ministers had made on her mind. He accordingly selected Adamson, archbishop of St. Andrews, for this delicate mission, who assured the queen that the king his master was sincerely attached to the reformed church. Elizabeth expressed her-

[1] Heylin, l. v. 201, 202.

self highly gratified with this information, and recommended him to keep constant to the same profession, which would secure and preserve her friendship[1].

The ministers had fled to Newcastle, where they joined the banished lords, with whom they made common cause, and united with them in invading the kingdom with an army which they collected on the borders, and advanced to Stirling. The king lay there with some forces which he had hastily collected and placed under the command of Sir James Haliburton of Pittcurr; but bloodshed was avoided by James's wisdom and merciful disposition, which stood in bright contrast to the warlike and pugnacious conduct of the presbyterian ministers who accompanied the rebels. James entered into treaty with the rebel lords, and even consented to restore them to his favour; but this pacification prepared the way for the establishment of presbytery, which has always succeeded by rebellion and the sword in the face of Christ's solemn assurance, that His kingdom is not of this world. He affected no human glory or temporal power, but renounced them all, and allowed no swords or staves to be used in the hour of his humiliation and suffering: hence the church's place is to *suffer*, and not to *fight* for Christ, as the disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. But presbytery and the holy discipline have always made their way by means of the sword and of resistance to all the powers that be,—a mark which no time or circumstances seem capable of effacing.

Some of the sincerer sort incited one Watson, a young preacher, whom the archbishop of St. Andrews had placed in Edinburgh after the desertion of the city ministers, to insult the prince in his sermon, for which he was committed to Blackness. James Gibson, minister of Pencaithland, on this, usurped the pulpit lately occupied by Watson, and declaimed with extreme violence against the prince and some courtiers, alleging the prince was a persecutor, "on whom he denounced the curse that fell on Jeroboam, that he should die childless, and be the last of his race." This presbyterian worthy was arraigned before the privy council, where he not merely confessed his denunciations, but gloried in them. He was committed also; but Watson expressing contrition, was discharged.

When bad men combine and conspire, it becomes necessary for good men to unite for self-defence. Elizabeth very justly conceived that she was the principal party aimed at by the HOLY

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 338.

LEAGUE in France, entered into by the continental princes at the instigation of the pope. She therefore despatched Sir Thomas Bodly to treat with the king of Denmark and the protestant princes of Germany; and Sir Edward Wotton to Scotland, to contract a league, offensive and defensive, against the popish members of the holy league. James entered so heartily into her views, that he summoned a parliament to meet at St. Andrews, to whom, "in a long and pithy speech," he explained the danger to be apprehended, and the necessity for union. He procured an act to be passed, pretty unanimously:—"We, &c. understanding that divers princes who term themselves catholics, have joined, under the pope's authority, in a most unchristian confederacy against the true religion . . . . . with full intention to prosecute their wicked resolution, not only within their own estates and dominions, but likewise in other kingdoms . . . . . and in divers parts begun to be executed with hard and cruel effects; and considering withal how it hath pleased God to bless this realm with the sincerity of the gospel . . . . . we have thought it requisite not only to unite ourselves . . . . but also, for withstanding the dangerous course intended against all the professors of the truth, we have judged it needful that a general league and christian confederacy of princes and states, professing *the true religion*, should be opposed to the ungodly confederacy of the enemies thereof; especially that the two crowns of Scotland and England, which nature, blood, habitation, and the profession of *one religion*, hath joined, may be inseparably united by a firmer and stricter league than hath been betwixt any princes their progenitors in times past." The act goes on to bind the king and his nobles, by their most solemn oath, to assist Elizabeth with all the military resources of the kingdom, in the event of her being attacked by any of the princes of the holy league[1].

John Spottiswood, of Spottiswood, or more familiarly *of that Ilk*, died this year, on the 5th December, in the 76th year of his age. He was the father of the archbishop and historian. His father was killed at Flodden Field, standing shoulder to shoulder with his unfortunate sovereign James IV., and he was left an orphan at the early age of four years old. He took the degree of M.A. at Glasgow, but was diverted from his intention of taking holy orders by the persecution which raged so violently in the commencement of the reformation. He fled to England, and was introduced to archbishop Cran-

[1] Spottiswoood, b. vi. 339-40.

mer, "and was by his means brought to a knowledge of the truth," and by whom he was ordained priest. After some time, he was presented to the parsonage of Calder, about twelve miles west from Edinburgh, by Sir James Sandilands. He went to France, in company with the lord James, at the time of the queen's marriage; and when the reformation began to assume a regular form, he was chosen superintendent or bishop of Lothian, which he governed wisely for twenty years. "His care in teaching, planting of churches, reducing people and persons of all sorts into the right way, was great, and so successful as, within the bounds of his charge, none was found refractory from the religion professed. In his last days, after the plots for presbyteries were formed, and when he saw the ministers take such liberty as they did, and heard of the disorders raised in the church, through that *confused parity* which men *laboured to introduce*, as well as the irritations the king received by a sort of foolish preachers, he lamented extremely the case of the church to those that came to visit him. He continually foretold that the ministers, by their follies, would bring religion in hazard, and, as he feared, provoke the king to forsake the truth; therefore wished some to be placed *in authority* over them, to keep them in awe; for the doctrine, he said, we profess is good, but the old policy was undoubtedly the better; God is my witness, I lie not[1]." He took, however, a most decided part against his unfortunate sovereign Mary, after her escape from Lochleven, and entered heartily into the disloyal views of the kirk, which appointed a fast and prayer that her enterprise might come to nought. He wrote an admonition to his diocese, in which he joined the general hue and cry against her, and denounced her as guilty of all the enormous crimes of which her enemies, without the slightest proof, laid to her charge. "We see," says he, "a wicked woman, whose iniquity known, and lawfully convict, deserved more than ten deaths, escaped from prison: . . . . . for if she had suffered according as God's law commands to murderers and adulterers to die the death, the wickedness taken from Israel, the plague should have ceased; which cannot but remain so long as that innocent blood traitorously shed is not punished; . . . . and so I fear not to affirm that the reservation of that wicked woman, against God and the voices of his servants, is the first and principal cause external which man can see of the plague and murder lately begun." These were not fit sentiments for a christian bishop, even if she had

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 344.

been as wicked as her enemies falsely said she was; and he concluded his letter with denouncing the pains of excommunication against any one who would support her cause. "The tenor of the letter is, indeed, very pithy; but, however, we may most justly observe, that whether the queen was guilty or not guilty of the crime laid against her, yet there neither was *then* (so far as we can see), nor has been to this day, any proper foundation to say that her majesty was *lawfully convicted* thereof. By the history of the time, and the acknowledgment of this letter, it would seem the greatest number of the kingdom thought the magistracy not lawful[1]."

1586.—Actuated by a spirit of revenge, Andrew Melville, on his own authority, called a number of barons, gentlemen, and ministers together, as a synod, at St. Andrews, and accused archbishop Adamson of various acts subversive of the presbyterian discipline; but especially of having devised and procured the passing of the late acts of parliament in 1584, and of traducing the brethren who had fled to England. James Melville attacked the archbishop on the corruptions of the human and satanical bishops, saying, "that Adamson being a minister in the kirk, the dragon had so stung him with the venom of avarice and ambition, that, swelling exorbitantly, he threatened the destruction of the whole body, were he not immediately and courageously cut off, and exhorted the synod to play the chirurgeon boldly." Adamson made a powerful defence, and said that the statutes were not of his devising; but when proposed in parliament, he gave his opinion that they were good and lawful acts. They alleged that the second act was a ratification of the episcopal jurisdiction, inasmuch as it ordained the dignity and authority of the three estates to stand unaltered, according to the ancient custom of the realm. Adamson replied to this, "That the bishops were not by themselves an estate, but they represented in a part the estate of the church, which was ever reputed the first estate of the realm since the kingdom became christian; and that in the act alleged no jurisdiction was established; howbeit, for the episcopal power there was enough to be said, if the time and place were fitting." He reminded them that they were not his judges; but perceiving their determination to proceed, he very properly declined the jurisdiction of the court, and appealed to the prince against any sentence they might pass on him. Nevertheless, the synod immediately, and without any other form of trial, passed sentence of ex-

[1] Keith's History, pp. 491, 492.

communication on the archbishop, in his absence. But, in denouncing this sentence, which ought never to be lightly passed, and certainly never in order to gratify the passions of malice and revenge, by which the synod was evidently actuated, their courage failed them, and no one had the hardihood to pronounce the words. The synod were about to separate in dismay, when a young fellow (Andrew Hunter), a student, and one of the spectators, starting up, asserted, *that he was moved by the Holy Spirit* to denounce the anathema of the synod against the archbishop, and which he did accordingly. James was obliged to temporise with these factious demagogues; and it is to be regretted that the archbishop himself, for the sake of peace, submitted to the synod. Yet this gross dereliction of his duty did not assuage the rage and malice of his presbyterian enemies, who peremptorily urged the justice of their sentence, which handed over their spiritual father to the dominion of Satan and the pains of hell. This indecent and uncharitable transaction was the next day retorted by one of the archbishop's relations, Mr. Samuel Cunningham, who entered the reader's desk, and read the same form of excommunication against the two Melvilles and Hunter[1].

These transactions forcibly exhibit the uncharitable feelings of the age, and how little the ministers were influenced by the spirit of the gospel, when excommunications were more frequently and vexatiously employed, by men of all parties, against each other, than ever the Roman pontiff in the plenitude of his power had exercised. Neither the prince's temporising, nor the archbishop's submission, satisfied the presbyterian party. They protested against any relaxation of the sentence pronounced on the archbishop, and contended that he ought still to be esteemed as one justly delivered to Satan, till his conversion was seen to be true and effectual, or, in other words, till he should denude himself of his episcopal office, and acknowledge his inferiors to be his superiors, which was in truth their object,—to vex and weary out the titular bishops, and in the end to exclude them entirely from the church. The whole of their new system was to reverse the order of God's institution. The party carried their malignity so far as to propose to excommunicate all the old loyal episcopal ministers, who had dutifully subscribed and obeyed the late acts of parliament, for curbing the licentiousness of the presbyterian ministers; but the number of the episcopalians was discovered to be so great, that they were obliged to withdraw the motion, lest it

[1] Calderwood, 199.—Spottiswood, b. vi. 315.

should have caused an irreconcilable schism, and have shewn the smallness of their own number. Nevertheless, the proposal was a powerful evidence of the malignancy of their disposition, and of their having succeeded in overturning the established titular episcopacy by unfair means and by unceasing agitation. So intolerably pragmatic had "the sincerer sort" become (by which term Calderwood always designates the most fiery and intractable of the ministers), that James was compelled, on Sunday, the 2d of January, "to rebuke Walter Balcanquhal publicly, after sermon in the great kirk, and said he would prove that there should be bishops and spiritual magistrates endued with authority over ministers; and that he (Balcanquhal) had not done his duty in condemning that which he had done in parliament. Mr. Walter undertook to prove the contrary[1]." Their refractory and turbulent conduct, not only collectively in their courts, but individually in their capacities of parish ministers, so perplexed the prince, and impeded the government, that the lord chancellor advised him to leave them to their own devices, "for," said he, "in a short time they would become *so intolerable*, that the people would chase them forth of the country." The prince replied, "True; if I were purposed to undo the church and religion, I should esteem your counsel good, but my mind is to maintain both; therefore can I not suffer them to run into these disorders that will make religion to be despised[2]." Here is a wise and prudent resolution in a young man not yet twenty years of age; and marks, in strong contrast, the paternal feelings of the royal breast, with that diabolical spirit in the presbyterian party, which impeded his whole government, and which a respectable presbyterian author of the present day says, "exerted in Scotland the malignant influence that might have been anticipated from it—which extinguished the feelings and hardened the hearts of those who gloried in supporting it,—which spread all the rancour of exasperated bigotry throughout the community, and gave rise to scenes of intolerance and persecution, from which every humane and christian spirit must shrink with the strongest disapprobation[3]."

In the Assembly, which had met in May, more "plots for presbyteries" were made, and alterations made in those already planned. Calderwood, who is a champion in that cause, says, "The reader is here to be advertised, that presbyteries were erected before the breach made in the kirk, anno 1584; and

[1] Calderwood, 197. [2] Spottiswood, b. vi. 347.
[3] Cook's Hist. of Ch. of Scotland.

that now they are restored, and *a new plot* of kirks to be united in presbyteries, *somewhat different from the former, is devised*[1]." It would therefore appear that the presbyterian discipline was not reduced to shape all at once, but various plans had been tried and rejected before the system of the present day was adopted. James gained an advantage in this Assembly, by getting them to submit quietly to his prerogative of calling all the subsequent General Assemblies; and he determined that in future they should meet only once a year. He likewise managed to extort from them their acceptance of bishops under certain limitations, and whose power was to be *in ordinis causa, non jurisdictionis*. Archbishop Adamson's appeal to the king was so far successful, that James compelled the Assembly to remove the sentence of excommunication; but not without a vigorous protest from Hunter, the adventurous youth who pronounced it, and his supporter, Andrew Melville[2].

1587.—Ecclesiastical affairs were proceeding in their usual disorderly and turbulent manner when the news of his mother's intended murder suddenly reached James, and which is elsewhere narrated[3], by which he was placed in a most difficult position. To have attempted her rescue by military operations would have been madness; and all his negotiations were foiled by the treachery and corruption of his ambassadors, who yielded to the influence of Elizabeth's gold. With a heroism worthy of all praise, Mary never would sell her birthright (which the apostle calls "profaneness"), by abdicating the throne of Scotland, or sinking her claim of succession to that of England; for although, by violence and usurpation, she had been unjustly deprived of it, yet her *right* remained undiminished. James was now, therefore, by his mother's martyrdom, and by just and lineal right of succession, the undoubted sovereign. He had just completed his twenty-first year, and he summoned what, in reality, was his first parliament. He signalized his majority by entertaining his whole nobility at Holyrood House, and reconciling them to each other, in order to remove those deadly feuds which distracted the kingdom with intestine wars and bloodshed.—"On the 15th day of May this year, the king, being at Holyrood House, convened his whole nobility that had any quarrel one at another, where he solemnly composed all their differences, and, in his presence, made them embrace one another, and drink together; and to that end, that the whole realm might,

[1] Calderwood, 206. [2] Ibid. 206, 211. [3] Post chap. ix.

take the better notion that this was his majesty's own proper work, he caused them to walk two and two, in each other's hands, from Holyrood palace to the cross of Edinburgh, and the king himself with them, where they sat themselves down at a long table to a banquet prepared for them by the city; at which there were solemn expressions of joy and reconciliation, with mutual embraces of one another; and his majesty, to crown that day's work, drank to them all peace and happiness. This reconciliation of the nobility and divers of the gentry was the greatest work and happiest game the king had played in all his reign hitherto[1]."

The king, by royal proclamation, called an Assembly on the 20th of June,—Andrew Melville was chosen moderator. It was the king's intention to have settled all disputes with this factious body; but he found it was an easier matter to compose the feuds of his nobility, than to produce a christian feeling among the ministers, and all his abilities and address failed to establish any sympathy betwixt himself and the godly brethren. They maintained a constant running fight against the lawful authority of the king and of the titular bishops; against the latter they thundered their impotent anathemas and excommunications, with greater wantonness and injustice than the pope, in the utmost plenitude of his power, had ever attempted. The chancellor and justice-clerk were sent by the king to desire satisfaction of the Assembly for the insults offered to him by James Gibson and John Cooper; and, also, that their sentence of excommunication should be removed from Montgomery, archbishop of Glasgow. All which the godly brethren refused, except on such conditions as were insulting to the royal authority to grant, viz.—an unlimited promise to grant whatever petitions they should prefer to the ensuing parliament; to which, if his majesty would agree, "they would labour to bring matters to such a middest, as might best agree with the honour of the ministry, satisfy the offence of the godly, and the consciences of their brethren[2]." This extraordinary answer incensed the king; but he became much more indignant at their refusal to elect Robert Pont to the bishopric of Caithness, to which he had appointed him on the death of his uncle, the earl of March, the former titular bishop. They bluntly told the king, "that divers Assemblies had damned the estate of bishops;" and, therefore, they not only refused to elect Pont, but peremptorily prohibited him from accepting the bishopric. This see accordingly remained void until the Assembly of

[1] Balfour's Ann. i. 384-85. [2] Spottis. b. vi. 304.—Calder. 215-16.

1600 agreed that a certain number of ministers should sit and vote in parliament[1].

The thunders of the Assembly, and the exactions of the duke of Lennox's agents, who had possessed themselves of the temporalities of the archbishopric, reduced Montgomery to such necessity, that he resigned the see of Glasgow in favour of William Erskine, a mere layman, who had not even the mock orders which could be given by the godly brethren at that time. Erskine had been for some time the settled minister of Campsie, and no challenge was ever made to his being a layman. This laic contrived, notwithstanding the opposition made by the godly, to keep possession of the see, till the king, wearied with their continual brawls, re-appointed James Beaton, the former Roman Catholic archbishop, who enjoyed the see till his death in 1603. He had been the late queen's ambassador at the court of France[2].

To maintain their determined hostility to the order of bishops, this Assembly appointed David Lindsay and Robert Pont, in name of the kirk, to demand of the parliament, "that the prelates should be removed, as having no authority from the church, and most of them neither function nor charge in it whatever." The abbot of Kinloss entered into a long and spirited defence of the right of the spiritual estate to sit in parliament; and complained "that the ministers had, in a most unjustifiable manner, shut them forth of their places in the church, and now attempted to exclude them from their lawful places in the estate, which he hoped his majesty would not suffer; but, on the contrary, would punish the petitioners for their presumptuous arrogance." After a keen encounter of their tongues, the petition was rejected. Some other petitions, however, were received, viz. for the ratification of all the laws made during the king's minority in favour of the Church—for trying and censuring the adversaries of true religion—and for the punishment of such as did menace or invade the ministers of the church[3].

In the parliament, which met this year, the temporalities of the bishoprics were annexed to the crown, under pretext of bettering its revenues, and relieving the subjects from supporting the expenses of the government. These hollow pretexts, and alleging that the reservation of the prelates' houses and precincts, with the tithes of the churches annexed to their benefices, would be amply sufficient to maintain their place and

[1] Keith's Cat. 217. [2] Ibid. 262. [3] Spottiswood, b. vi. 365.

dignity, imposed on the king[1]; but the real motive which actuated those with whom this spoliation originated, and which they explained to the satisfaction of the godly part of the ministry, was, "that this was the only way to *undo* the prelacy: for there being no livings to maintain them, none would be found to accept of bishoprics[2];" and Calderwood confesses "that by this means they thought they should be no more troubled with bishops[3]." To deceive both the "godly" and the simple and honest ministers, hopes were raised that the tithes should be employed at their pleasure. But both the king and the ministers were soon undeceived, for parliament next confirmed the grants of those church lands that had formerly been bestowed on, or which had been seized by, the nobility. The priors and abbots, at the Reformation, secured the lands belonging to their convents by procuring temporal lordships, and that which was now annexed had been begged from the crown; so that the church, by these public robberies, was completely plundered and impoverished. The godly brethren themselves began to see the horrible wickedness of this act; and, when too late, they raised a furious clamour when they discovered the real selfish motive, although they had cordially assented when blinded with the flattering unction of the extirpation of the bishops. The king strongly recommended, in his Basilicon Doron, to his son and successor to rescind "this vile pernicious act," as he called it; and the attempt was one of the chief causes of the rebellion in King Charles's reign.

A multitude of seminary priests and jesuits from the continent stole into the kingdom, for the purpose of intriguing with the popish lords regarding their assisting the Spanish Armada, which, about this time, threatened England with invasion. "The rumour," says Calderwood, "being blazed abroad, fervent were the prayers of the godly—powerful and piercing were the sermons of preachers, especially in the time of fast." These emissaries proposed to James to unite his forces with the Spaniards, and, by invading England on the Scottish border, to make a diversion in their favour, and at the same time to gratify his own feelings of revenge for his mother's murder; promising, also, to bestow on him the kingdom of England as a reward for his alliance. James's sagacity led him to apprehend danger to his own kingdom; and he had the good sense to see the improbability of the Spaniards conquering a kingdom to bestow on him, which, in the course of

[1] Balfour's Ann. i. 355. [2] Spottis. b. vi. 365. [3] True History, p. 218.

nature, would descend to him in right of succession. He therefore issued a proclamation against all priests, jesuits, and their abettors, and gave authority to apprehend and imprison their persons. This wise precaution, however, was far from giving satisfaction to the godly, who generally were disposed to execute more summary and energetic measures of punishment. As usual, they most uncharitably represented the king's proclamation as a sure indication of his attachment to popery. James Gibson, one of the city ministers, even denounced the king, from the pulpit, as a papist and a persecutor, and prophesied that he should be the last of his race. This intemperate language attracted the notice of government; and the preacher was summoned before the privy council. He acknowledged his offence, and was sentenced to the mild punishment of pronouncing from the pulpit, in his next sermon, that he had spoken and rashly unadvisedly. This he promised to do; but, at the proper time, he entirely omitted the apology: and when challenged by the lord chancellor for contempt of the sentence of the privy council, he coolly replied, "that out of infirmity and weakness he had confessed a fault, albeit his conscience did tell him he had not spoken any thing that might give just offence." The chancellor perceiving that this godly firebrand had been tampered with, complained to the Assembly, and demanded its judgment. That *loyal* body at first declined to interfere, but, being urged, they cited Gibson; who refusing to appear at their bar, the Assembly took up the matter on an entirely different ground. He had now offended the godly, and had dared to be contumacious; and, therefore, for contempt of their own court, but without any reference to the lord chancellor's complaint, they suspended him during pleasure. The next Assembly, in August, removed his suspension, without consulting the king's pleasure; which so exasperated James, that he intended to take cognizance of Gibson in the civil court. That worthy, however, retired to England, where he was entertained by the puritan brethren, "who were, even at that time, labouring to introduce 'the holy discipline,' as it was called, into the Church of England[1]."

1588.—The alarm created in the kirk by the resort of the jesuits and the threatened Spanish invasion, induced the ministers to meet in an extraordinary Assembly in Edinburgh on the 6th of February, for advising the government in the present emergency, "touching the dangers threatened to religion and the readiest means for quenching the fire of papistry."

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 367.

They chose Robert Bruce to be moderator, a fiery, pragmatical man, who had begun to preach about a year before without any public call or ordination to the ministry, which shows the rapid downward course of the "holy discipline." He studied his theology under Melville, and being found meet for his purposes, was by him urged to commence preacher in this irregular way, "and was from that time forth a chief actor in the affairs of the kirk, and a constant maintainer of the established discipline[1]." This Assembly, which, having been convocated without the king's knowledge or consent, was illegal, adopted the following resolutions:—1. That the laws of the country should be prosecuted against jesuits, seminary priests, idolators, and the maintainers thereof . . . . . 2. That in regard of the danger so imminent, his majesty and council to proceed in execution of the laws against the principal jesuits and their maintainers without delay. 3. That the noblemen, barons, ministers, and whole Assembly, should go together to his majesty and regret the peril whereunto the church and kingdom was brought by the practises of jesuits, making offer of their lives, lands, goods, and gear, to be employed at his majesty's direction for preventing their wicked devices[2]." They appointed two o'clock that afternoon to go in a body to Holyrood House; but James hearing of their intentions, "grew into a choler, and said 'they meant to boast (menace) him with their power, and force the execution of their demands:'" and he therefore refused to receive so great a multitude, but agreed to give audience to a few deputies of their body. The king was obliged to shut his eyes to this insult, and also to the illegality of their assembling together, to acknowledge the justice of their complaints, and to promise redress at a convenient season. A deputation of the Assembly went to Holyrood House the following day, and desired that Gordon and Crichton, two jesuits, should be apprehended; and that those noblemen, who harboured them, should be punished according to law. The king promised to arrest the jesuits; but he intended to pursue a calmer and more respectful course with the noblemen. This drew the king into collision with the lords Maxwell and Herries, who had set up the mass at Dumfries, and had driven the minister out of the town[3].

James took measures for assisting Elizabeth against the invincible armada. But by the good providence of God it was completely destroyed, and the cruel designs of the Romanists

[1] Calderwood, p. 218. [2] Spottiswood, b. vi. 366-7.
[3] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 367.—Heylin, lib. viii. p. 294.

were entirely crushed. Parliament met in July, and enacted, "That professed and avowed jesuits and seminary priests, found in any part of the realm, should be taken, apprehended, called, pursued, and incur the pains of *death*, and confiscation of their moveable property; and whosoever should wittingly and willingly receive or supply them, for the space of three days and nights, should forfeit their life-rents[1]." A BAND was also entered into, and subscribed by the king and his parliament, to maintain the established religion, which now in all the three kingdoms was threatened and in the most imminent danger, "as well by foreign preparations for prosecution of that *detestable conspiracy* against Christ and the evangel, called the HOLY LEAGUE."

The General Assembly met at Edinburgh on the 6th of August, and enacted, "That, in time coming, at the commencement of every General Assembly, the first day of meeting shall be observed as a fast;" and the following Thursday and *Sunday* were appointed to be kept as fast-days. The king had bestowed his cousin, the sister of the late duke of Lennox, on the earl of Huntly; but the ministers of Edinburgh refused to perform the marriage ceremony unless he would previously sign the Confession of Faith. They inhibited all others from officiating also, but in particular archbishop Adamson; who, nevertheless, married the parties on the 21st of July, and without requiring them to sign the Confession. The Assembly then cited Adamson to appear at their bar, but he treated their citation with contempt. That meeting, therefore, gave a commission to the presbytery of Edinburgh to proceed against him in their own court, "and to give sentence as the Assembly itself might do, according to good order and the discipline of the kirk." The presbytery accordingly deprived him of all office and function in the kirk, and the following Assembly ratified and confirmed their sentence, which they directed "to be published in all the churches of the kingdom, *only to make the bishop hateful and contemptible*." This Assembly also silenced the notorious Gibson, on his accusation of contumacy; but took no notice of the charge preferred against him by the king, whom he had basely libelled from the pulpit; and a fast was appointed to be kept in October on three successive Sundays. This custom of fasting on Sundays is borrowed from the Church of Rome, and was improved on by the godly ministers; for most of their fasts were appointed on that weekly festival. In memory of our Saviour's resurrection, the first day of the

[1] Calderwood, p. 221.

week has ever been esteemed a festival by the universal church: and to appoint a fast on that day of rejoicing is to do despite to the Lord that bought them; and, in fact, it is a virtual denial of his resurrection and of our justification.

1589.—The influx of jesuits still continued to alarm the brethren, after all danger from the Spanish invasion had ceased, notwithstanding "their powerful and piercing" appeals to rouse the passions of the mob against them. The most vigilant of the ministers assembled in Edinburgh, and petitioned the king and council for "preventing the dangers threatened to the professors of the true religion within the realm, that commissioners be directed to some special persons of his highness's council, to search, seek, apprehend, and present to justice, all jesuits and other private and public seducers of his highness's lieges,—and seeing the special occasions of the suspicions of his highness's sincerity to the truth, under whose wings all jesuits and others devoted to the superstitious religion of Rome find shelter, they required that proclamations might immediately be issued, to the confusion of the papists and their patrons, and the comfort of the godly, offended in times past with the oversight and long toleration of them." The malicious suspicions of the brethren were so strong of the king's secret inclinations towards popery, to the contrary of which he had given them many undeniable proofs, that they never ceased to importune his majesty to assure his subjects by proclamation of his zeal and care to root it out of the kingdom; and, now that he had arrived at mature age, "that he would again subscribe to the Confession of Faith, and renew the charge given in his minority to all his subjects." With all this the good-natured king complied, in order, if it were possible, to remove the unfounded clamours that these godly brethren, with a most mischievous tendency and effect, had raised and propagated, of his secret attachment to the Church of Rome. Accordingly, the king, with his whole council and household, subscribed the band or national covenant[1]. These covenants have been a worse evil than the opening of Pandora's box: instead of a bond of unity, they have been the cause of disunion and discord. We have Moses and the prophets, and if we will not hear them, it will not be all the bands, covenants, and solemn leagues twice told, that ever were signed, sworn to, or ratified, from Dan to Beersheba, that will keep men to their duty. The word of God is all-sufficient, and piercing as a two-edged sword, and it is sufficient for doctrine

and reproof; and to put faith in bands and covenants, is a departing from God's holy word, decidedly taking man for a defence, and in heart going from the Lord.

It cannot be denied, says Heylin, that James most heartily despised this covenant; for he alleged at the Hampton Court conference, "that Mr. Craig (the compiler), with his renouncings and abhorrings, his detestations and abrenunciations, did so amaze the simple people, that few of them being able to remember all the particulars, some took occasion thereby to fall back to popery, and others to remain in their former ignorance; so that if he had been bound to that form of Craig's, the confession of his faith must have been in his table-book, and not in his head!"[1] The Apostles' Creed has been the confession of the faith of the universal church, from the days of the apostles to the present time. It requires no table-book to help the memory: every man should carry it both in his head, and in his *heart*. But the Melvillian kirk and the Westminster brethren laid aside this ancient confession as a papistical charm, and the latter merely inserted it as a postscript into their catechism: it had become "an old almanac," unworthy of the modern improvements of the Geneva school. At their first entering into this band, the godly brethren, as they called themselves, grew so audaciously insolent, that the king could by no means bring them to reason. They interfered in all the affairs of his government, and most pertinaciously encroached on the royal prerogative, defamed the government, and insulted his person with the most virulent personal abuse.

The Assembly met in June, and was honoured with the king's presence. He desired them to confirm the appointment of Patrick Galloway, the minister of Perth, to be one of his chaplains, to which the Assembly unanimously agreed, on account of the king's zeal in suppressing the attempts of the Popish lords, and his vigilance against the jesuits. During this short harmony which existed betwixt James and the Assembly, he required the brethren to subscribe the following articles:—"1. That the preachers should yield due obedience to the king's majesty. 2. That they should not pretend to any privilege in their allegiance. 3. That they should not meddle in matters of state. 4. That they should not publicly revile his majesty. 5. That they should not draw the people from their obedience to the king. 6. That when they are accused for their factious speeches, or for refusing to do any thing,

[1] Heylin's History of the Presbyterians.

they should not allege the *inspiration of the Spirit*, nor feed themselves with colour of conscience, but confess their faults like men, and crave pardon like subjects." But the godly brethren were wiser in their generation than to subscribe articles so much at variance with their principles and practices; they thanked him, and replied they were well enough; but were resolved to hold their own power,—let him look to his[1]. If resistance to the king, as supreme, was thus to be made a fixed principle of religion, it would become a curse to mankind instead of a blessing, by unsettling the whole frame of society. And had not the faithful page of history recorded the *ungodly* conduct of these brethren, it would be almost incredible, that men calling themselves christians, assuming the character of ambassadors for Christ, and styling themselves, *par excellence*, "godly," should have compelled the king to propose such articles for their subscription. It is a bitter commentary on their principles, a severe rebuke on their practices, and a sure proof that "they knew not what spirit they were of."

The earls of Errol, Huntly, and some other lords attached to the church of Rome, had been in active correspondence with the king of Spain, and by his emissaries had been induced to assume arms, with the intention of seizing the king's person, and of re-establishing the papal religion. The king went against them at the head of a well-appointed army, when the rebels dispersed without bloodshed; and the king, with his usual clemency, took the revolted lords again into favour, being solicitous of preserving internal peace on his marriage with a princess of the House of Denmark, which was at that time under negociation.

The cordiality which existed at the commencement of the Assembly, betwixt that body and the king, did not last long. The marriage of the earl of Huntly was doomed to be a bone of contention betwixt them that at first presented rather a formidable appearance. Although the Assembly had prohibited archbishop Adamson from performing the marriage ceremony, yet he esteemed the king's command as a sufficient warrant, and set the authority of the Assembly at defiance: and depending on the king's protection, he denied the jurisdiction of the presbytery, and their competency to try him, even though armed with the plenary authority of the Assembly. The presbytery of St. Andrews summoned the archbishop to their bar; when he not only refused to appear, but denied their jurisdiction.

[1] Heylin's History of Presbyterians.

They proceeded against him in absence, deprived him of all office and function in the kirk, and threatened him with excommunication. The Assembly ratified and confirmed the sentence of the presbytery, and ordained that it should be read from every pulpit in the kingdom, which shews the shocking state of anarchy and insubordination which the so-called *holy discipline* had introduced. But this unjust, petulant persecution was in accordance with the system which was now acted on for the purpose of extirpating the episcopal order, and to bring both the man and his office into contempt. The king was exceedingly incensed at this wanton encroachment on the royal prerogative, but was obliged to dissemble his anger; being desirous of avoiding any open feud with the ferocious presbyterians on the arrival of the queen, who was daily expected[1]. But unfortunately forbearance only increased the turbulence of the party.

1590.—Balfour, in his Annals, states that, in the year 1585, an ambassador was sent from Denmark to negociate a matrimonial alliance between king James and the princess Anne, of Denmark. The proposal was not entertained at that time; but the earl Marshal this year was sent ambassador to demand the hand of that princess in the year 1589. In September the marriage took place by proxy, and immediately after the queen with her train embarked for Scotland; but contrary winds compelled the fleet to seek shelter in a port of Norway, where, a severe frost setting in, their farther progress was delayed. On the arrival of messengers at the Scottish Court, that the queen might be immediately expected, preparations were made for her reception; but in a short time another messenger arrived to announce her detention by the inexorable ice of the Baltic, and that she could not arrive till the following spring. "The king taking this impatiently, concludeth within himself to go thither in person." He took this resolution privately in Craigmillar Castle, and named it to no one, as he knew that so many impediments would be thrown in the way by the chancellor, the privy council, but more particularly by the brethren of the kirk, that if he might go at all, there would be so much time consumed as would render his voyage unnecessary. He therefore gave out that he intended to send the chancellor to Norway, and thus effected the preparation of some ships without exciting the slightest suspicion, not even in the mind of the chancellor himself. When the ships were ready, and the chancellor only waited for his commission, the king went quietly on board and

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 376-7.

set sail, leaving the following letter, and some instructions for his privy council, on his table, written entirely with his own hand, and unknown to any one:—

"In respect that I know that the motive of my voyage will be at this time diversely scanned, and misinterpreting may be made, as well to my dishonour as to the blame of innocents, I have thought fit to leave this declaration for resolving all good subjects, first of the causes that moved me to undertake this voyage, then in the fashion in which I resolved to make the same. As to the causes, I have been generally blamed by all men for deferring my marriage so long, being alone *without father, mother, brother, or sister;* and yet a king not only of this realm, but the heir apparent of another. This my nakedness made me weak, and mine enemies strong: for one man is no man as they speak; and where there is no hope of succession, it breeds contempt and disdain; yea, the delay I have used hath begot in many a suspicion of impotency in me, as if I were a barren stock. These and other reasons moved me to hasten my marriage, from which I could yet have longer abstained if the weal of my country could have permitted. I am not known to be rash in my weightiest affairs, neither am I so carried with passion as not to give place to reason; but the treaty being perfected, and the queen on her journey, when I was advertised of her stay by contrary winds, and that it was not likely she should perfect her voyage this year, I resolved to make that on my part possible which was impossible on hers.

"The place where I first took this resolution was in Craigmillar, none of my council being present; and as I took it by myself, so I bethought me of a way to follow the same: and first I advised to employ the earl of Bothwell in the voyage, in regard he is admiral; but his preparation took so long time, that I was forced to call the council . . . . . when, as they met, they found so many difficulties in sending forth a number of ships for the queen's convoy (for so I gave it out), and who should be the ambassadors, that I was compelled to avouch, if none should be found to go, I should go myself alone in a ship; adding, that if men had been as willing as became them I would not have needed to have been in these straits. This, the chancellor taking to touch himself, (for he knew he had been slandered all that time for impeding my marriage), partly out of zeal to my service, and partly fearing that I should make good my word if no better way could be found, made offer to go himself in that service. This I embraced, keeping my intention from all men, because I thought it enough for me to

put my foot in a ship when all things were ready, and from the chancellor himself (from whom I never kept any of my weightiest businesses) for two reasons; first, because, if I had made him of my council in that purpose, he had been blamed for putting the same in my head (which had not been his duty), for it becomes no subject to give his prince advice in such matters; withal considering what hatred and envy he sustained unjustly for leading me by the nose, as it were, to all his appetites, as though I were an unreasonable creature, or a child that could do nothing of itself, I thought it pity to heap more unjust slanders on his head. The other reason was, that I perceived it was for staying my journey that he made offer to go; so was I assured, if he had known my purpose, he would either have stayed himself at home, or, thinking it too heavy a burthen for him to undertake my convoy, he would have lingered so long as there should not have been a possibility for making the voyage. This I thought meet to declare (and upon my honour it is the truth), lest I should be esteemed an imprudent ass, that can do nothing of myself, and to save the innocency of that man from unjust reproaches. For my part, besides that which I have said, the shortness of the way, the surety of the passage, being clear of all sands, forelands, and such other perils, safe harbours in these parts, and no foreign fleets resorting in these seas, it is my pleasure that no man grudge at this my proceeding, but that all conform themselves to the directions I have given to be followed unto my return, which shall be within twenty days, wind and weather serving; and if any shall contravene these, I will take it as a sufficient proof that he bears me no good will at his heart: as to the contrary, I will respect all that reverence my commandments, in the best sort I may. Farewell[1]."

James was magnificently entertained at the court of Denmark; and some idea of his enjoyments may be gathered from an expression in one of his familiar letters to the lord chancellor, in which he says, with the good humour which marked his character, "We are just drinking and driving owre here in the auld way as we did at hame." This shews that James felt himself at home at the Danish court, and that the manners of the country pretty much resembled those of his own. After spending some months agreeably, the royal couple returned in safety to their own kingdom. They landed at Leith on the 20th of May, and were received with every demonstration of joy. The following day the council met to de-

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 378.

liberate on the queen's coronation, which the king determined should be celebrated with the greatest pomp. But, on account of the absence of all the titular bishops in their dioceses, the king appointed Robert Bruce, one of the city ministers, to anoint the queen. This proposal met with the fiercest opposition from the presbyterians, but especially from Andrew Melville. They even threatened to excommunicate Bruce if he should use the unction, as smelling rank, in their nostrils, of popery; and no argument could induce them to drop their opposition to a ceremony for which there is Scripture warrant, till the king, impatient and irritated at their obstinacy, threatened to postpone the coronation till the arrival of some of the bishops, who, he said, would entertain no such scruples. This was a greater evil than the other. Melville now changed sides, and argued for the anointing as pertinaciously as he had formerly opposed it; and Bruce was accordingly licensed to use this "popish charm," as they termed it, rather than suffer the persecuted bishops to gain any ascendancy at court[1].

Disobedience to all lawful authority was one of the most prominent features of the Melvillian party. Gibson, who had reviled and insulted the king in the pulpit, and had been suspended by the Assembly during their pleasure, not for that gross and unfeeling act, but for having neglected to answer their citation, was still permitted to preach, not only at his own parish of Pencaithland, but to officiate for other ministers. The contumacious brethren were brought before the council, who excused their disobedience by saying they thought his silencing was only to last till the meeting of the next Assembly. On being shewn the act, however, that it was during pleasure, which the Assembly had not yet had an opportunity of expressing, they confessed their disobedience, and promised to refuse him their pulpits till he was duly restored. Gibson himself was then summoned to answer for his conduct before the council; but this he declined to do, and was therefore denounced a rebel[2].

The General Assembly met at Edinburgh in June,—Patrick Galloway, moderator. James Melville preached a most intemperate sermon against "the belly-god bishops of England, who, he said, were seeking conformity of our kirk withtheirs. He more particularly directed his invectives against Adamson, archbishop of St. Andrews. "Because," said he, "we have lurking within our own bowels, a poisonous and venomous

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 380.—Balfour's Annals, i. 388.
[2] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 318.—Calderwood, p. 255.

Psyllus, so empoisoned with the venom of the old serpent, and so altered in his familiar food and nourishment, to wit, lies, falsehood, malice, and knavery, who hath been lurking a long time, hatching a cockatrice egg; and so finely instructed to handle the whistle of that old enchanter, that no Psylius, Circe, or Medea, could have done better." "This was Mr. Patrick Adamson, who was to set forth a book against the established discipline, which he entitled Psyllus. In his epistle dedicatory to the king, he declareth it is his purpose to suck out the poison of the discipline of the kirk of Scotland, as the Psilli, a venomous people in Africa, suck out the venom of the wounds of such as are stung with serpents. . . . . He exhorted his brethren to ratify and approve the sentence of excommunication, justly and orderly pronounced against him, forewarning them if they did not, they would find and feel yet more grievously the reserved poison of that Psyllus for their undutiful negligence, if God of his mercy stay it not[1]." This was the system on which the Melvillian party persecuted not only Adamson, but all the titular bishops, who, notwithstanding the establishment of presbytery, still maintained their places in the kirk.

The king in great state and parade honoured this Assembly with his presence, and appears in some degree to have conciliated the ministers, for they exhibited more courtesy towards his majesty than on any former occasion. The moderator presented three petitions in the name of the church,—for establishing her jurisdiction, and abolishing all acts made to the contrary; for purging the country of Jesuits, seminary priests, and excommunicated persons; and for providing a competent maintenance for the ministers from their own parishes, &c. The king replied, that in all parliaments the first acts concerned the liberty of the church: respecting Jesuits, it was notorious what pains he had taken for their expulsion, previous to his voyage to Denmark, and still he should do what he lawfully could, to remove them from the country: and for the tithes, he desired them to choose some sober members to meet and consult with his privy council for satisfying their desires. Calderwood alleges, "that these answers did little content the Assembly[2]." The king, addressing the Assembly, seriously recommended them to remove the horrid barbarous murders and violences that were daily committed, by exhorting the people in their sermons to live peaceable

[1] Calderwood, p. 256. [2] Ibid.

lives.[1] "In the end," says Calderwood, "he stood up, and uncovering his head, said, 'he praised God that he was born in such a time, as in the time of the light of the gospel, to such a place, as to be king of such a kirk, the sincerest kirk in the world. The kirk of Geneva kept Pasch and Yule: (Easter and Christmas) what have they for them? they have no institution. As for our neighbour kirk in England, their service is an ill-mumbled mass in English; they want nothing of the mass but the liftings. I charge you, my good people, ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort the people to do the same; and I, forsooth, so long as I bruik my life and crown, shall maintain the same against all, deadly.' There was nothing heard for a quarter of an hour, but praising God and praying for the king![2]"

The speech here attributed to the king bears improbability at least, not to say falsehood, on the face of it. Spottiswood does not record it, which, with his usual impartiality, he would certainly have done, had these words ever been uttered. But James was too politic a monarch to deliver such sentiments, even if he had entertained them, which were certain to have given deep offence to the people of England, whose good opinion it was so much his interest at that time to cultivate. Besides, it is in the highest degree improbable that he would have thus praised the principles of the brethren, with whom he had lived in a constant state of contention ever since the introduction of the "holy discipline." They had never ceased to resist his lawful authority, to revile his person and government from their pulpits, and to teach the people committed to their charge to do the same. They had slandered and persecuted his mother, had made, and were still making, the most desperate attempts to erect themselves into a clerical republic, and to assume a dictatorial, pragmatic interference in all the most minute movements of his court and government. Therefore it is not unreasonable to conclude that this was a *pious fraud* of the historian, a doing evil that good may come, to delude posterity into the belief that "the holy discipline" was patronized and esteemed by James. The contrary of which is the fact, for he opposed it to the utmost of his power, and at last conquered it.

This Assembly passed an act for the better instruction of the brethren in the nature of the holy discipline; for although

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 362. [2] Calderwood, p. 256.

the Melvillian party had gained a short-lived ascendancy, yet the presbyterian discipline was neither understood nor much liked by the greater part of the ministers. There was then no such idea entertained that the church of Christ could subsist without *an establishment;* and therefore those ministers who adhered to episcopacy never dreamt that when persecuted in one city they could flee unto another. But, indeed, it is not to be supposed that the presbyterian party would, at that time, have tolerated any secession from their "holy discipline." Toleration forms no part of that discipline. Difference of opinion was considered a damnable sin, and difference in modes of worship was idolatry, punishable with *death* at the hand of the civil magistrate, or "*at the hand of any multitude*," says Knox, "*when God doth illuminate their eyes, and put the sword within their grasp.*" It cannot, therefore, be surprising, that in all the ecclesiastical changes of the sixteenth century, the ministers retained their benefices without disputing the will of the dominant party for the time being. All the presbyteries that had as yet been erected were commanded to procure copies of the new Book of Discipline, under special penalties; "Forasmuch *as it is CERTAIN that the WORD OF GOD cannot be kept in sincerity, unless the HOLY DISCIPLINE is observed!*"[1] This is an unparalleled piece of assurance, which exceeds even the effrontery of the papal claim of infallibility. This is an insult to the Most High, to say that his word can only be kept by a discipline which, at the time these words were uttered, was not *ten years old!* What had become of the Scriptures heretofore, which had been committed to the church as their keeper, and which is the pillar and ground of the truth, and had been preserved and handed down by the church from the days of Moses and the apostles? The church is the pillar and ground of the truth, not only as teaching it, but also as supporting and preserving it, by the authority with which Christ has invested her. Therefore the apostle directs the bishops to speak, exhort, and rebuke, with all authority, and to suffer no man to despise them; not to prostitute nor give it up to any unauthorized hands, which is a betrayal of their trust, and an incapacitating themselves to preserve the truth which had been committed to them. "Wherever the power of Christ has been lessened or transferred, there the truth has suffered proportionably. Thus, when the Pope would transfer to himself the power of the whole catholic church, and reduce all bishops under him as

[1] Calderwood, p. 257.

deputies and substitutes, and had transferred the episcopate into the pontificate, what *errors* in doctrine and *heresies* did ensue, even to *idolatry?* And thus when the episcopate was overthrown in England, in the late times (of the Commonwealth), and transferred into the hands of the people, what swarms of *heresies* arose, like locusts out of the pit, and darkened the face of the whole land[1]?"

1591.—John Erskine, of Dunn, superintendent of Mearns, died this year. He was one of those who were ordained and originally placed as bishops by Knox. He governed the diocese committed to his charge with great prudence and moderation, "and with great authority, till his death, giving no way to the novations introduced, nor suffering them to take place within the bounds of his charge, whilst he lived. A baron he was of good rank, wise, learned, liberal, and of singular courage; who, for diverse resemblances, may well be said to have been another Ambrose. He died the 12th of March, in the 82d year of his age, leaving behind him a numerous posterity, and of himself and of his virtues a memory that shall never be forgotten[2]."

The king's liberty, and even his life, were in continual and imminent danger, from the treasonable plots and conspiracies of the earl of Bothwell, who was openly supported in his rebellious courses by the godly brethren. Francis Stewart, earl of Bothwell, was the son of the lord John, prior of Coldingham, one of James the Fifth's illegitimate sons; his mother was the daughter and heiress of James Hepburn, the late earl of Bothwell and duke of Orkney. Francis was also illegitimate, and had been created earl of Bothwell by James VI. "A man he was," says Heylin, "of a seditious and turbulent nature, principled in the doctrines of the presbyterians, and thereby fitted and disposed to run their courses." At first he joined the banished lords, who seized the king at Stirling in 1585, in order to ingratiate himself with that faction, and gain the applause of the kirk. But his profligacy and immorality were so great, that the ministers were obliged to disavow him, and bring him to do penance publicly on the cutty stool. He made due submission and the most unbounded promises, and thereby regained the favour of his old friends and patrons; and presuming on their favour, he began to consult those who had the character of being witches respecting the death of the king, with a view to seizing on the crown. He was arrested, and committed to prison; but making his

[1] Rehearsals, vol. iv. 232-234. [2] Spottiswood, b. vi. 383.

escape, his property was confiscated, himself proclaimed a traitor, and all communication with him interdicted. He then entered into a conspiracy with some in the court itself, which failed, and he fled into England. But his faction in the court still remaining, he was privily introduced to the palace of Holyrood House: after securing the gates and guards, he violently attempted to seize the king in his bed-chamber. The king hearing the unusual noise, quickly retreated to a tower of the palace, and secured the doors and passages; which the traitor not being able to force, he attempted to set the palace on fire, and burn the king within it. Before he could accomplish his purpose the alarm was given, and the citizens hastening down to the rescue, Bothwell made his escape.

Andrew Melville also gave James perpetual trouble, by his determined encroachments on the prerogatives of the crown, and by his overbearing and turbulent contentions with such of the brethren as were peaceably inclined. A dispute arose between the Assembly this year and the College of Justice, in which the brethren attempted to constitute themselves judges in a purely civil cause; and, accordingly, they summoned John Graham, one of the judges, to their bar. The whole of the judges opposed this encroachment on the dignity and independence of the Court of Session. Judge Graham protested against them for remedy at law, but the Assembly "found themselves judges in the cause; therefore willed him to say what he could say in his own defence, otherwise they would give process, and minister justice[1]."

Archbishop Adamson, who had suffered so many persecutions from the brethren, died this year. He fell into great poverty, partly owing to his own imprudence, and partly by the king having granted the revenues of his see to the duke of Lennox, and he was left destitute of all support. On his death-bed some of the brethren induced him to subscribe a paper, without knowing its contents,—condemnatory of episcopacy, and approving of the "plots for presbyteries." This recantation is purely fictitious, and got up, like the king's speech, to give a lustre to "the holy discipline of Geneva,"—for his steady opposition to which, Adamson had been persecuted, excommunicated, and deposed, while living, and, after death, his memory slandered and defamed. When informed of the trick practised on him, he denied having recanted, and complained heavily of the injustice done him, "and committing his cause to God, ended his days in the end of this

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 381.

year. A man he was of great learning, and a most persuasive preacher, but an ill administrator of the church patrimony, which brought him to the misery that is pitiful to think of. Divers works he left, of which some are extant, that shew his learning; but his prelections upon the Epistles to Timothy, which were most desired, falling into the hands of his adversaries, *were suppressed*[1]." It is not a good symptom of the truth of a cause when it is found necessary to suppress the works of an antagonist when they are too powerful to be overturned by arguments; nevertheless, he does not appear to have been very extensively acquainted with the history of the primitive church; of which we had an instance in his signing some articles favourable to presbytery in the year 1580, that is, if Calderwood's authority may be depended on. "That nature had furnished him with a good stock, and he was a smart man, and cultivated beyond the ordinary size by many parts of good literature, is not denied by the presbyterian historians themselves: they never attempt to represent him as a fool or a dunce, though they are very eager to have him a man of tricks and latitude[2]."

A disgraceful schism broke out in the presbytery of St. Andrews, on occasion of the election of a preacher for the parish of Leuchars. The rival candidates were Patrick Wymess and Robert Wallace. Andrew Melville, with six followers, voted for Wallace, whilst Thomas Buchanan,—another fiery spirit, with twenty others, voted for Wymess. The contention between these brethren became at last so fierce, that Melville adjourned with his faction to his college, where, constituting themselves a presbytery, they elected Wallace without opposition; whilst Buchanan, with the majority, remained and sustained their previous election: in consequence there were two rival brethren destined for the same charge. The parishioners, as a matter of course, followed the laudable example of their ghostly guides, and split into two virulent parties. The synod of Lothian cited these brethren, and directly accused Melville of having caused a schism and secession. Melville made a stout resistance, and denied having made any schism; "for," said he, "albeit he and his followers had left the place, yet he could not be judged to have made secession, by reason the others had given the cause, and conspired to prefer a person in worth not comparable with him they had elected; and as for a majority, votes ought not to be counted, but to be weighed and pondered!" It was found impossible

[1] Spittiswood, b. vi. 385. [2] Fund. Charter, 241.

to assuage the exasperated passions and the rancorous heat of contention which the imperious conduct of this violent man had occasioned. The synod, therefore, set aside the two former candidates altogether, and appointed a third party to the vacant charge. The hatred and animosity of the leaders in this schism were so fierce and vindictive, that the synod was compelled to divide the presbytery into two, and to appoint one to meet at Cupar, and the other at St. Andrews. "Thus," says Spottiswood, "was that strife pacified, which many held to be ominous, and that the government which did at the beginning break forth into such schisms, could not long continue. For this every man noted that, of all men, none could worse endure parity, and loved more to command, than they who had introduced it into the church[1]."

1592.—The General Assembly met at Edinburgh in May, and the brethren presented a petition to parliament, which, after several prorogations, had sat down, requesting—I. That the act of parliament made in the year 1584, against the discipline of the kirk, and liberty thereof, should be abrogated and annulled, *and a ratification* granted of the discipline whereof they were then in practice. II. That the act of annexation should be repealed, and restitution made of the church's patrimony. III. That the abbots, priors, and other prelates bearing the titles of churchmen, and giving voice for the church, without any power and commission from the church, should not be admitted in time coming to give voice in parliament, or to convene in their name. IV. That a solid order might be taken for the purging the realm of idolatry and blood, wherewith it was miserably polluted.

The second and third of these articles were rejected; the first, and most important, was the subject of long debate. Although presbytery began to make its appearance in 1575, yet, up to this date, it had not received the sanction of the legislature. And, in point of fact, titular episcopacy had never ceased, and never did entirely cease, although the authority of the titular bishops was not obeyed, and they themselves were subjected to the most annoying persecutions. The king was very unwilling, either to repeal the acts of 1584, which confirmed his supremacy, or to sanction the holy discipline. The repeal of these acts would have destroyed his prerogative and the supremacy of the crown, and licensed the ministers "to utter false, untrue, and slanderous speeches, to the reproach of his majesty, and to meddle with the affairs of his highness and

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 386.

estates," with impunity. His majesty, therefore, strenuously opposed the ratification of the holy discipline, although he was at last obliged to yield, owing to the critical state of his affairs, which were embroiled by the continual seditions and treasonable attempts made against his life by the traitor Bothwell, who was secretly instigated and encouraged by the brethren. He was induced to consent to their repeal, by the persuasion of the lord chancellor Maitland; "for which," says Calderwood, "*they had laboured many years*, and which he did to pleasure the ministers, offended at him for hounding out the earl of Huntly against the earl of Moray," whom he had inhumanly murdered. "So the act passed," says Spottiswood, "but in the most wary terms that could be devised." It was only declared, respecting the act of supremacy, "That the said statutes should be no way prejudicial nor derogatory to the privilege which God hath given to the spiritual office-bearers in the church, concerning the heads of religion, matters of heresy, excommunication, collation or deprivation of ministers, or any such essential censures grounded and having warrant of the word of God[1]."

It was also determined by this act of parliament, "that it shall be lawful to the kirk and ministers, every year at the least, and oftener *pro re nata*, as occasion and necessity shall require, to hold and keep General Assemblies, providing that the king's majesty, or his commissioners for him to be appointed by his highness, be present at each General Assembly, before the dissolution thereof, and nominate time and place when and where the next General Assembly shall be holden."

The Assembly appointed some brethren to wait on the king, and to recapitulate bluntly the sins and enormities of himself and family, and to admonish him gravely, in the name of the eternal God, to have respect in time to the state of the true religion, to the many murders and oppressions daily multiplied through impunity and lack of justice,—and to discharge the kingly office in both, as he shall eschew the fearful challenge of God, and avert his wrath from himself and the whole land, and, that he might be the better informed, to lay down the particulars unto him, and to crave his answer[2]. Notwithstanding the king's good nature, he did not much relish their arrogant familiarity. One part of their faithful warning, it is to be lamented, was but too true,—that the kingdom was filled with violence, and that the most enormous crimes escaped unpunished, from the king's uncommonly merciful disposition; so that, in

[1] Spottiswood, 388.—Calderwood, 208—271. [2] Calderwood.

effect, the king's clemency became the most intolerable tyranny to the weaker part of the nation, which was harassed with unrestrained spoliation and murder, by the powerful barons.

At last, after a fierce struggle of *twelve years*, computing from the year 1580, when the Geneva "novation" got the authority of an act of Assembly, or *seventeen years* from the first broaching of the doctrine of parity by Dury, at the instigation of Andrew Melville,—we have at last arrived at a sort of equivocal, unwilling establishment of the presbyterian government. And Calderwood admits that it cost many years of labour to accomplish its recognition by the authority of parliament, and which the king seized the first opportunity to set aside, and to restore the old episcopal government, which had been held in such reverend estimation by the whole nation, "and the learned, grave, and honest men of the ministers;" "its very form purchasing it respect." The whole current of our history decidedly shows what difficulty the presbyterian party encountered in their reiterated attempts to introduce the holy discipline into the church, and which at first cost them seventeen years of contention, before they could secure a legal establishment. Nevertheless, the titular bishops still continued to hold their offices in the church, though without jurisdiction, and their places in the state; subject, however, to the unrelenting persecution, hatred, and scurrilous abuse of the brethren.

All historians have hitherto, as if by a sort of tacit consent, written of the Church of Scotland as if it had been originally, and without any controversy, Presbyterian, and without noticing the violent convulsions which agitated the kingdom during the progress of Melville's designs. I have endeavoured to show, from the unimpeachable testimony of contemporary and presbyterian historians, that the reverse of this is the fact; and that the Church, founded by Knox in 1560, was undeniably prelatical, and continued to be so without challenge, till Melville and Dury began their attack upon it, anno 1575, when presbytery was first mooted; and that it was not established for fully seventeen years of contention and intrigue afterwards.

CHAPTER IX.

THE DEATH OF MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS.

The queen's rights—Character.—State of the country.—The queen's liberality.—The lord James, his ambition.—Bishop Leslie—His account of Moray's intrigues—Who opposes the queen's marriage—Takes up arms—instigates to murder of Rizzio.—Queen's escape from danger.—Hatred of Moray and Darnley.—Moray's guilty knowledge of Darnley's murder—Accused thereof by several parties.—Camden's account.—Bothwell the actual perpetrator of Darnley's murder.—Bothwell tried and acquitted.—Intrigues of the nobles—Their usage of the queen.—Elizabeth's share in these transactions—Forged letters, &c.—Bothwell's violent abduction of the queen—His marriage with the queen—Her flight into England.—Babington's conspiracy.—The queen's trial.—James's exertions to save his mother.—The ministers refuse to pray for the queen.—the king insulted from the pulpit.—public worship ceases.—The queen's behaviour—Her request to queen Elizabeth.—Attempts made to poison Mary.—Wingfield's letter to Cecil.—Notice given to prepare for death.—Description of her person and dress—Her message to the king—Her request to the English peers present.—The earl of Kent's answer.—Her further suit denied—but afterwards granted.—Description of the room and apparatus of death.—The dean of Peterborough's exhortation.—The queen's objections to his ministry.—Her prayer—Her conduct previous to death.—The execution.—Her body embalmed and interred—Inscription on her tomb—Some reflections on her state and circumstances.—The fate of her enemies—with their confessions.—Earl of Moray—The effects of his ambition—His murder.—Bothwell, duke of Orkney—His death, character, and confession.—Kirkaldy of Grange.—Morton—His confession.

While James was tormented, in a sort of living purgatory, by the seditious and ungovernable conduct of the Presbyterian teachers, he was suddenly roused by the bloody catastrophe of his unfortunate mother's long imprisonment—a murder that will ever reflect indelible disgrace on the memory of Elizabeth.

The brief and turbulent reign of the unhappy and ill-used Mary ceased *de facto* at Carberry Hill; her right *de jure* continued to the period of her legal murder. The infamous lies and forgeries of the author of Knox's history, and his contemporary George Buchanan, have been by many historians followed, and even improved on. The democratical and rebellious principles inculcated by these two eminent men operated most foully and fatally not only during her whole reign, but has worked like a canker ever since. The malignant poison infused by them has pursued her memory with a satanical

ferocity worthy only of the great father of lies. Malignity, slander, and forgery, seem to have been the peculiar characteristics of the Scottish reformers of that period; and who have left such a stain of infamy on the national character as no time can obliterate, and to which no country can present a parallel. "Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry[1]."

Mary was unquestionably one of the first women of the barbarous age in which she lived. While young, beautiful, and accomplished, she had filled and adorned the throne of France. She was well qualified for business, and capable of making extraordinary bodily exertion; she was actuated by a frank and generous spirit; with a quick vivacity, both of mind and body, as even her bitterest enemies acknowledged; and she was also endowed with a ready and graceful eloquence. The death of her husband, the French king, compelled her to return to her native kingdom, which was distracted by religious rancour; and the royal authority set at nought by a barbarous nobility, who, from so many and recent minorities of the crown, had become nearly independent princes, and waged with each other the most deadly and murderous feuds. The Protestant ministers of the period were most bigotted and uncharitable; of a dictatorial, censorious habit, in their speech and conversation; and often guilty of the most petulant rudeness and familiarity to their sovereign. Yet, with a charity and moderation unknown to the age, and certainly never practised by her enemies, and with a discretion which shows the superiority of her understanding, she confirmed the Protestant religion by proclamation, on her first arrival from France, when she found it to be the established profession of the majority of her subjects. She only claimed for herself the free exercise of the religion of that church in which she had received her christianity, and in which she firmly believed she should find salvation. She solemnly protested, in her reply to the superintendents' and ministers' petition, that she "did not in any time coming intend to force the conscience of any person, but to permit every one to serve God in such a manner as they are persuaded to be the best[1]." Nevertheless, the bigotted ministers, in their infuriated zeal against popery, would, by no persuasions, allow the same toleration to their sovereign, which she, unsolicited, and out of the native goodness of her heart, freely permitted to the meanest peasant in her kingdom.

Mary was surrounded by traitors from the first moment of her treading on Scottish ground, the principal of whom was

[1] 1 Sam. xv. 23 [1] Spottiswood.

her bastard brother, the Lord James, whom she created earl of Moray. He was a man of considerable ability, cunning, and hypocrisy. By the most horrid crimes, of which he had the address to make others the instruments, he raised himself superior to his sovereign, and seated himself on her throne. Dreading his ambition, his father James V. placed him in the church, the pope's bull dispensing with his bastardy, which disqualifies for church endowments. He was, first, prior of St. Andrews, and sat as such in the parliament of 1560, as one of the spiritual estate; he next obtained the priory of Pittenweem, and also that of Mascon, in France. Of course, he took the usual oaths to the pope and the archbishop. But the church was not the object of the lord James's ambition. The stirring times of the Reformation, in the turbulent regency of Mary of Lorraine, drew him from the cloister, and he exchanged the cowl for the helmet. At the early age of seventeen, he entered into a correspondence with the court of England, and engaged in a traitorous conspiracy with it against his country, his sovereign, and family[1]. Such a commencement in treason would naturally ripen into a manhood of determined rebellion; and, accordingly, we find him engaged in repeated rebellions, murders, and regicide, and making a cloak of religion to cover his ambitious designs on the throne.

Leslie, the learned and loyal bishop of Ross, has long since represented the lord James in his true colours; but the ample cloak of religious hypocrisy, for obvious reasons, has with great care and caution covered over the unnatural villany of the *good* regent. Leslie was Queen Mary's ambassador at the court of England, and one of her commissioners at York, Westminster, and Hampton Court, and continued to the last faithful to his imprisoned queen. He says,—"But it is the earl of Moray we have, above all, to charge and burthen. I will make my beginning with the great and unnatural unkindness and ingratitude showed by him to his dear sister and most bountiful mistress and sovereign.

"At what time she minded, after the death of her first husband, the French king, to repair unto her own realm of Scotland, she sent forthwith for him into France, and asked his advice and counsel in all her affairs, even as she did also after her return into Scotland, so far that she had but, as it were, the name and calling, he bearing the very sway of the regiment, and by her honoured and adorned with the earldom of Moray; and at length, by one means or other, furnished with so great and ample possessions, that besides other commodities and advan-

[1] Goodall.

tages, the yearly rent thereof passeth and surmounteth the sum of twenty and six thousand pounds, after the rate of their money.

"Behold now the thankfulness of this good and grateful nature! he laboured and endeavoured all that he possibly could to withhold the queen's mind, and stay her from all manner of marriage, and to entail the crown of the realm upon himself (though he was illegitimate, and incapable thereof), and to the name and the blood of the Stuarts; but when he saw and thoroughly perceived, and well knew, that the queen was fully minded and earnestly bent, and had now determined to join herself in marriage with the lord Darnley, he practised means, by his assistance and procurement, to have slain him and his father, and to have imprisoned her at Lochleven, and to have usurped the government himself, as he now doth.

"But now when he saw this his intent and purpose disclosed and prevented, and that the solemnization of the marriage was already past, he showed himself and adherents in open field and in arms against the queen his mistress; whereupon he was driven to flee into England; at which his then abode he instantly besought and solicited for aid against his sovereign, which was worthily denied him.

"Then began he to practise with the earl of Morton, by his letters and messengers, about the detestable slaughter of David, the queen's secretary, who, by their mischievous sleight and crafty persuasion, induced the lord Darnley,—promising him to remove the queen from meddling with all political affairs, and actually to put him in possession of the crown, and of the rule and government of the realm,—to join with them in traitorous conspiracy against the queen, his most dear and loving wife, and most dread sovereign; whereupon the murder was in most horrible and traitorous ways committed in the queen's own chamber of presence, upon him, violently plucked from the queen; she also being cruelly menaced and sore threatened, having also a charged pistolet set to her belly, being then great with child, and then removed from her privy chamber into another, where she was kept a prisoner.

"The young, inexpert, and rash lord Darnley, who, being blinded with outrageous ambition, could not foresee the devilish drift of these most crafty merchants, began now, but almost too late, to espy it; and seeing himself as nigh the danger as was his wife the queen, repaired to her, most humbly asking her pardon of his heinous attempt, and pitifully crying out to her to provide and find out some present way to preserve themselves both; who, by the queen's politic industry, was

privily with herself conveyed away out of the rebel's danger, and by him this wicked drift, and the drivers and contrivers thereof, were discovered to the queen.

"But lo! the next day after this slaughter, the earl of Moray entered Scotland, and repaired to the queen with as fair a countenance as though he had been clear, as well for that fact as for all other treasons; whereof the gentle and merciful queen pardoned him, admitting him again into her graces, love, and favour. Whereat the lord Darnley, much misliking, and vehemently repining, feared that he would be, as he was indeed, when he saw his time, revenged upon him, because he was of him delated to the queen for being one and the chief of the councellors, aiders, and assertors in the conspiracy about the murder of the secretary now committed.

"These and the like imaginations so deeply sunk into, and pierced the young man (lord Darnley's) heart, that he finally resolved with himself, by one means or other, to rid the earl of Moray out of his way. Whereat he went so far forth, that he communicated his passion to the queen, who did most highly mislike therewith, and most vehemently deterred him from the said his intent: yet did he break the matter farther as to certain other noblemen, by whom at last it was revealed to the earl of Moray. Wherefore, the earl did for ever after bear him a deadly enmity and hatred. Whereupon at length, all other attempts failing him, this execrable murder was by him, the said earl Moray, and by the earl Morton, first devised, and afterwards committed in such strange and heinous sort as the world knoweth and detesteth.

"Is it unknown, think ye, my lord of Moray, what lord Herries said to your face openly, even at your own table, a few days after the murder was committed? did he not charge you with the fore-knowledge of the said murder? did he not, *nulla circuitione usus*, flatly and plainly burthen you, that you, riding in Fife, and coming with one of your most assured trusty servants, the said day wherein you departed from Edinburgh, said to him, among other talk—this night, ere morning, the lord Darnley shall lose his life?

"Is it not full well known, that ye and the earls Bothwell, Morton, and others, assembled at the Castle of Craigmillar, at dinner-time, to consult and devise on this mischief. If need were, we could rehearse and recount to you the whole sum and effect of the oration made by the most eloquent among ye (Lethington), to stir up, exhort, and inflame your faction then present, to determine and resolve themselves to despatch and make a hand with the lord Darnley.

"We can tell you, that John Hepburn, Bothwell's servant, being executed for his and your traitorous fact, did openly say and testify, as he should answer the contrary before God, that you (Moray, Morton, and Lethington) were principal authors, counsellors, and assistants with his master, of this execrable murder, and that his said master so told him.

"We can tell you, that John Hay of Galloway, that Powry, that Dalgleish, and last of all, that Paris, all being put to death for this crime, took God to record, at the time of their death, that this murder was by your counsel, invention, and drift committed; who also declared, that they never knew the queen to be participant or ware thereof.

"We can further tell you of the great goodness of God, and of the mighty force of truth, whereby although ye have wonderfully tormented and tossed, though ye have reached and put to death as well innocents as guilty, your own confederates, and offered many of them their pardons, so they would depose any thing against the queen, God hath so wrought, that, as for neither torments nor fair promises they could be brought falsely to defame their mistress, so without any torments at all, they have voluntarily purged her, and so laid the burden on your neck and shoulders, that ye shall never be able to shake it off."

The above testimony of the bishop of Ross is most amply corroborated by Camden, an English contemporary author, who had the best opportunities of gaining information, being employed by secretary Cecil, and intrusted with his papers. He repeats the same facts as those already quoted from Lesslie, and nearly in the same words. I commence his narrative at the place where the bishop concludes:—

"These two, above all things (meaning Moray and Morton), thought it best utterly to alienate the queen's mind from the king, their love not being yet well renewed, and to draw Bothwell into their society, who was lately reconciled to Moray, and was in great grace with the queen, putting him in hope of divorce from his wife, and marriage with the queen, as soon as she was a widow. To the performance hereof, and to defend him against all men, they bound themselves under their hands and seals, supposing that if the matter succeeded, they could, with one and the same labour, make away with the king, weaken the queen's reputation among the nobility and commons, tread down Bothwell, and draw unto themselves the whole management of the state.

"Bothwell, being a wicked-minded man, blinded with am-

bition, and thereby desperately bold to attempt, soon laid hold on the hope propounded, and lewdly committed the murder, while Moray, scarce fifteen hours before, had withdrawn himself farther off to his own house, lest he should come within suspicion; and that he might from thence, if need were, relieve the conspirators, and the whole suspicion might light on the queen. No sooner was he returned to the court, but he and the conspirators commended Bothwell to the queen for a husband, as most worthy of her love, for the dignity of his house, &c.

"Now the confederates' whole care and labour was, that Bothwell might be acquitted of the murder of the king. A parliament is therefore forthwith summoned for no other cause, and proclamations set forth, that such as were suspected of the murder should be apprehended. And whereas Lennox, the murdered king's father, accused Bothwell to be the murderer of the king, and instantly pressed that he might be brought to his trial before the Assembly of the estates began; this also was granted, and Lennox was commanded to appear within twenty days, to prosecute the matter against him. Upon which day, Bothwell was arraigned and acquitted by sentence of the judges,—*Morton managing the cause.*

"This business being despatched, the conspirators so wrought the matter, that very many of the nobility assented to the marriage, setting their hands to a writing to that purpose, *lest he*, being excluded from his promised marriage, *should accuse them as contrivers of the whole fact.* By means of this marriage with Bothwell, the suspicion grew strong amongst all men, that the queen was privy to the murder of the king, which suspicion the conspirators increased by sending letters all about; and in secret meetings at Dalkeith, they presently conspired the deposing of the queen, and the destruction of Bothwell. Yet Moray, that he might seem to be clear of the whole conspiracy, craved leave of the queen to go into France. Scarce was he crossed over out of England, when, behold! those who had acquitted Bothwell from the guilt of the murder, and gave him their consent under their hands to the marriage, took up arms against him, as if they would apprehend him; whereas indeed, *they gave him secret notice* to provide for himself by flight, and this to no other purpose but lest he being apprehended should *reveal the whole plot*, and that they might allege his flight as an argument to accuse the queen of the murder of the king. Having next intercepted her, they used her in a most disgraceful and unworthy manner, and clothing her in a vile

weed, thrust her into prison at Lochleven, under the custody of Moray's mother, who having been James's V. concubine, most malapertly aggravated the calamity of the imprisoned queen, boasting that she was the lawful wife of James V., and that her son Moray was her lawful issue[1]."

The conspirators, Moray, Morton, and Lethington, by whom Mary was surrounded, were constantly plotting her destruction, and these again were mere tools in the hands of the queen of England, who was the instigator of all the deeds of blood and treason which were entered into by these remorseless traitors. She was continually plotting with Mary's subjects, and kept the whole kingdom in a state of rebellion and resistance to the lawful authority of its natural sovereign, by all the arts of perfidy, hypocrisy, jealousy, and vindictiveness, which could incite the infuriated heart of a disappointed woman and a jealous rival. By the instructions of that master spirit, the earl of Moray, Lethington forged Mary's name to documents destructive of the lives of her best friends; and in order to destroy her reputation, he and Buchanan forged letters and sonnets of impassioned love for Bothwell, whom she detested. He forged her name to public documents, to answer the plans of ambition and treason of his villanous employer; and that junto of traitors had the address to attach the whole infamy of their unheard-of treasons, murders, and villanies, on the guiltless head of their too easy and generous sovereign. With the assistance of Buchanan and the author of Knox's history, they have handed down their calumnies to posterity as historical facts, but which have been triumphantly confuted by the laudable exertions of several modern authors. That Bothwell committed the double crime of abduction and rape on her person, cannot admit of doubt; and that she was compelled to marry him through force and constraint, will admit of as little doubt. That the perjured traitors who plighted their knightly honour at Carberry hill and broke it, who imprisoned her in Lochleven Castle and deprived her of the sovereignty, intended also to have consummated their villany by murder, is proved by the debates in the pretended parliament, and the menacing words of the regent Moray, when the captive queen entreated, that as a brother he would spare her life and reputation. "The latter," said he, "is already lost; but as to your life, the parliament must look to that." And the brutal Lindsay, says Lesslie, "most grievously, with fearful words, and very cruel and stern countenance, threatened her, that

unless she would subscribe," (the deed of abdication) "*she should lose her life.*"

Mary, however, escaped from the fangs of her enemies; but the imprudent rashness of her friends lost the decisive battle of Langside. In an unhappy moment of misplaced confidence, she took refuge in England, and solicited the protection of Elizabeth, who had secretly conspired with her brother and the seditious ministers, and who was at that very moment supporting Moray's ambitious views. Mary was now at her mercy, within her power, and presented one of the most glorious opportunities of acting towards a fallen queen with generosity and honour. But Elizabeth was so involved in the guilt of the times that she suppressed every sentiment of honour and heroism, and seized the unsuspicious queen as her prey, imprisoned her, and brought her to trial as a criminal.

The hopes of the Roman Catholics were naturally fixed on Mary, and as that body of christians had entered into several plots against Elizabeth, with the avowed intention of seating Mary on her throne: advantage was taken of one of these, entered into by one Babington, which served as a plausible excuse for consummating the long list of crimes against that unfortunate queen. Different opinions prevailed in the English council; some advised to despatch her by poison, but others recommended the course of law; which opinion prevailing, "certain noblemen, councillors, and judges, were chosen for the business," who, repairing to Fotheringay Castle, summoned her majesty before them, and charged her with being concerned in that conspiracy. With heroic fortitude her majesty refused to acknowledge the authority of the court, declined to answer, or to be tried as a subject, being herself the sovereign of an independent kingdom. Her doom, however, was fixed before; the court had merely to go through the necessary forms to preserve the appearance of legality. They found her guilty, and pronounced sentence of death, which was shortly afterwards confirmed by Elizabeth and the three estates of the English parliament.

When James heard of the horrid tragedy, he made every exertion to save his mother's life. He sent several ambassadors to negociate with Elizabeth, but to no purpose; for they were won by bribes to betray him, and spin out the time till the execrable murder was effected. James finding all his efforts ineffectual, recalled his treacherous ambassadors, and commanded the ministers to pray for the queen his mother, "that it might please God to illuminate her with the light of his truth, and save her from the apparent danger wherein she

was cast." Not one of these worthy gentlemen, however, would do so, one only excepted; David Lindsay of Leith, alone of all the godly brethren, had sufficient charity and fortitude to obey the prince's precept. They kept Knox's unchristian example and uncharitable sentiments in remembrance, "that she was utterly unworthy of their prayers." The opposition to the prince's pious intentions was strongest in Edinburgh, the clerical watch-tower of the nation for sedition and treason: but as he was determined to carry his filial intentions into effect, he appointed a special day for offering up prayers in her behalf, and commanded archbishop Adamson to officiate on that day in St. Giles's church. This was too good an opportunity for insulting the feelings of the prince to be neglected,—the brethren might live a century without meeting such another opportunity. Accordingly, in the diabolical spirit which the presbyterian regimen infused into the ministers of the period, they prompted a young fellow named Cowper, who was not even in their own pretended orders, to mount the pulpit before the time, so as to exclude the archbishop. When James entered the church, and saw the pulpit thus occupied, he addressed the intruder from his pew, saying, "Master John, that place was destined for another; yet since you are there, if you will obey the charge that is given, and remember my mother in your prayers, you may proceed." But that was just what he had been placed there on purpose to omit, and adding blasphemy to his insolence,—he audaciously replied, "*He would do as the* SPIRIT OF GOD *should direct him*," clearly indicating the course which he intended to pursue. James commanded him to withdraw, but he refused to move; and the captain of the guard was therefore sent to remove him forcibly; but before leaving the pulpit, he denounced a woe on the people, and addressing the prince, said, "This day shall be a witness against the king in the day of the Lord." He also said to the king, that "he should make account one day to the Great Judge of the world for such dealing." The privy council sent Cowper to Blackness, with some other ministers who justified his conduct, and uttered seditious speeches; on which there was no public worship in Edinburgh, even the king's own chaplains, Craig and Duncanson, not only positively refused to pray for her preservation, but declined to officiate at all[1].

The queen was rather joyful than dejected at the near prospect of death, and thanked God that her sorrows were so soon to be ended. She wrote to Elizabeth, requesting, "in the

[1] Calderwood, p. 211.—Spottiswood.

name of Jesus Christ, by the soul and memory of Henry VII. progenitor of both, and by the royal honour and title which she had borne, that her body might be carried by her servants into France, to be buried beside her mother; that she should not be put to death secretly, but in the presence of her servants and others, who might witness her dying in Christ, against the false rumours which her adversaries might disperse of her; and that her servants might be permitted to go whither they chose, and enjoy the mean legacies she had bequeathed to them." To none of all these requests did the queen of England return any answer, under pretence that she had never received any such letter.

Elizabeth had made many efforts to have her taken off by poison, but could procure none base enough for that purpose; which made her break out into reproaches against the keepers, as "nice and precise fellows," and into scornful complaints of the "daintiness of their consciences." Persecution could not have been carried further than in the present instance; for Mary was peremptorily denied the consolation of her confessor in her last moments. She was even forced to hear the exhortations of the dean of Peterborough, who, with mistaken zeal, disturbed her peace with an attempt to make her a proselyte. At the block he persisted in speaking, when Mary said, "Peace, Mr. Dean; I have nothing to do with you, nor you with me." The noblemen then interfered, and prevented any further persecution. She then commended unto God the afflicted state of the Roman Catholic Church, prayed for her son, and for Elizabeth, and concluded, "As thy arms, O Christ! were spread on the cross, so with the outstretched arms of thy mercy receive me, and forgive me my sins." And as she was about to lay her head on the block she sent this charitable message, with her blessing, to her son:—"Although she was of another religion than that wherein he was brought up, yet she would not press him to change unless his conscience forced him to it; not doubting but, *if he led a good life*, and were careful to do justice and govern well, he would be in a good case in his own religion[1]."

The following simple and affecting narrative was written by Robert Wingfield, Esq. an eye-witness of this horrid tragedy, in his letter to Cecil:—

"It being certified, the sixth of February last, to the said queen, by the right honourable the earl of Kent, the earl of

[1] James I. Premonition to Christian Monarchs, cited in Leslie's Case Stated, fifth edition, p. 99.

Shrewsbury, and also by sir Amias Paulet and sir Drue Drury, her governors, that she was to prepare herself to die on the eighth of February next, she seemed not to be in any terror for aught that appeared by any of her outward gestures or behaviour, (other than marvelling she should die,) but rather with smiling, cheerful, and pleasing countenance, digested and accepted the said admonition of preparation to her, as she said, unexpected execution; saying, that her death should be welcome unto her, seeing her majesty was so resolved, and that that soul were too far unworthy the fruition of the joys of heaven for ever, whose body would not, in this world, be content to endure the stroke of the executioner for a moment. And that spoken, she wept bitterly, and became silent.

"The said eighth day of February being come, and time and place appointed for the execution, the queen being of stature tall, of body corpulent, round-shouldered, her face fat and broad, double-chinned, and hazel-eyed, her borrowed hair auburn. Her attire was this: on her head she had a dressing of lawn, edged with bone lace, a pomander chain and an Agnus Dei about her neck, a crucifix in her hand, a pair of beads at her girdle, with a golden cross at the end of them; a veil of lawn fastened to her caul, bowed out with wire, and edged round about with bone lace. Her gown was of black satin pointed, with a train and long sleeves to the ground, with acorn buttons of tett, trimmed with pearl, and short sleeves of satin black cut, with a pair of sleeves of purple velvet whole under them; her kirtle whole of figured black satin, and her petticoat skirts of crimson velvet; her shoes of Spanish leather, with the rough side outwards; a pair of green silk garters; her nether stockings worsted coloured watchett, cloaked with silver, and edged on the top with silver, and next her leg a pair of Jersey hose white, &c. Thus apparelled she departed her chamber, and willingly bended her steps towards the place of execution.

"As the commissioners and divers other knights were meeting the queen coming forth, one of her servants, called Melvin, kneeling on his knees to his queen and mistress, wringing hands and shedding tears, used these words unto her:—'Ah! madam, unhappy me! what man on earth was ever the messenger of so important news and heaviness as I shall be, when I shall report that my good and gracious queen and mistress is beheaded in England?' This said, tears prevented him of any farther speaking; whereupon the said queen, pouring forth her dying tears, thus answered him,—'My good servant, cease to lament, for thou hast cause rather to joy than mourn; for

now shall you see Mary Stuart's troubles receive *their long expected end* and determination: for know, (said she,) good servant, all the world is but vanity, and subject still more to sorrow than a whole ocean of tears can bewail. But I pray thee, (said she,) carry this message from me, that I die a true woman to my religion, and like a true queen of Scotland and France: but God forgive them, (said she,) that have long desired my end, and thirsted for my blood as the hart doth for the water-brooks. Oh, God! (said she,) show thou, [who] art the anchor of truth, and truth itself, and knowest the inmost chamber of my thought, how that I was ever willing that England and Scotland should be united together.—Well, (said she,) commend me to my son, and tell him that I have not done any thing prejudicial to the state and kingdom of Scotland;' and so resolving herself again into tears said, 'Good Melvin, farewell!' and with weeping eyes, and her cheeks all besprinkled with tears as they were, kissed him, saying, 'Once again farewell, good Melvin, and pray for thy mistress and queen.' And then she turned herself unto the lords, and told them she had certain requests to make unto them. One was for certain money to be paid to Curle, her servant: Sir Amias Poulett, knowing of that money, answered to this effect: 'It should.' Next that her poor servants might have that with quietness which she had given them by her will, and that they might be favourably entreated, and to send them safely into their countries; 'to this (said she) I conjure you last, that it would please the lords to permit her poor distressed servants to be present about her at her death, that their eyes and hearts may see and witness how patiently their queen and mistress would endure her execution, and to make relation when they came into their country that she died a true catholic to her religion.' Then the earl of Kent did answer thus: 'Madam, that which you have desired, cannot conveniently be granted, for if it should, it were to be feared, lest some of them, with speeches and other behaviour, would both be grevious to your grace, and troublesome and unpleasing to us and our company, whereof we have had some experience; they would stick to put some superstitious trumpery in practice, and if it were but in dipping their handkerchiefs in your grace's blood, whereof it were very unmeet for us to give allowance.'

"My lords (said the queen of Scots), I will give my word, although it be but dead, that they shall not deserve any blame in any the actions you have named, but, alas! poor souls, it would do them good to bid their mistress farewell; and I hope your mistress (meaning the queen), being a maiden queen, will

vouchsafe, in regard of womanhood, that I shall have some of my own people about me at my death, and I know her majesty hath not given you any such straight charge or commission, but that you might grant me a request of far greater courtesy than this is, if I were a woman of far meaner calling than the queen of Scots.' And then perceiving that she could not obtain her request without some difficulty, burst out into tears, saying,

"'I am cousin to your queen, and descended from the blood royal of Henry the Seventh, and a married queen of France, and an anointed queen of Scotland.' Then upon great consultation had between the two earls, and the others in commission, it was granted to her, what she instantly before earnestly entreated, and desired her to make choice of six of her best beloved men and women. Then of her men she chose Melvin, her apothecary, her surgeon, and one old man more, and of her women, those two who did lie in her chamber. Then with an unappalled countenance, without any terror of the place, the persons, or the preparations, she came out of the entry into the hall, stepped up to the scaffold, being two feet high, and twelve feet broad, with rails round about, hung and covered with black, with a low stool, long fair cushion, and a block covered also with black. The stool brought her, she sat down; the earl of Kent stood on the right hand, and the earl of Shrewsbury on the other; other knights and gentlemen stood about the rails. The commission for her execution was read (after silence made) by Mr. Beale, clerk of the council, which done, the people with a loud voice said, 'God save the queen.' During the reading of this commission, the said queen was very silent, listening unto it with so careless a regard, as if it had not concerned her at all, nay, rather with so merry and cheerful a countenance, as if it had been a pardon from her majesty for her life, and with all used such a strangeness in her words, as if she had not known any of the assembly, nor had been any thing seen in the English tongue.

"Then Mr. Doctor Fletcher, dean of Peterborough, standing directly before her without the rails, bending his body with great reverence, uttered this exhortation following:—

"'Madam, the queen's most excellent majesty (whom God preserve long to reign over us), having (notwithstanding this preparation for the execution of justice justly to be done upon you, for your many trespasses against her sacred person, state, and government) a tender care over your soul, which presently departing out of your body, must either be separated in the

true faith in Christ, or perish forever, doth for Jesus Christ offer unto you the comfortable promises of God, wherein I beseech your grace, even in the bowels of Jesus Christ, to consider these three things,

"'First, your state past, and transitory glory: Secondly, your condition present, of death: Thirdly, your estate to come, either in everlasting happiness, or perpetual infelicity. For the first let me speak to your grace, with David the king: forget (madam) yourself, and your own people, and your father's house: forget your natural birth, your royal and princely dignity; so shall the King of kings have pleasure in your spiritual beauty, &c.

"'Madam, even now, madam, doth God Almighty open you a door into a heavenly kingdom; shut not, therefore, this passage by the hardening of your heart, and grieve not the Spirit of God, which may seal your hope to the day of redemption.

"The queen three or four times said unto him, 'Mr. Dean, trouble not yourself nor me; for know that I am settled in the ancient catholic and Roman religion, and in defence thereof, by God's grace, I mind to spend my blood.'

"Then said Mr. Dean, 'Madam, change your opinion, and repent you of your former wickedness: settle your faith only upon this ground, that in Christ Jesus you hope to be saved.' She answered again and again, with great earnestness, 'Good Mr. Dean, trouble not yourself any more about this matter; for I was born in this religion, have lived in this religion, and am resolved to die in this religion.'

"Then the earls, when they saw how far uncomfortable she was to hear Mr. Dean's good exhortations, said, 'Madam, we will pray for your grace with Mr. Dean, that you may have your mind lightened with the true knowledge of God and his word.'

"'My lords,' answered the queen, 'if you will pray with me, I will even from my heart thank you, and think myself greatly favoured by you; but to join in prayer with you in your manner, who are not of one religion with me, it were a sin, and I will not.'

"Then the lords called Mr. Dean again, and bade him say on, or what he thought good else. The Dean kneeled and prayed, as follows: 'Oh, most gracious God,' &c.

"All the assembly, save the queen and her servants, said the prayer after Mr. Dean as he spake it, during which prayer, the queen sat upon her stool, having her Agnus Dei, crucifix, beads, and an office in Latin. Thus furnished with superstitious trumpery, not regarding what Mr. Dean said, she began

very fastly with tears and a loud voice to pray in Latin, and in the midst of her prayers, with over much weeping and mourning, slipped off her stool, and kneeling presently said divers other Latin prayers. Then she rose and kneeled down again, praying in English for Christ's afflicted church, an end of her troubles, for her son, and for the queen's majesty, to God for forgiveness of the sins of them in this island: she forgave her enemies with all her heart, that had long sought her blood. This done, she desired all saints to make intercession for her to the Saviour of the world, Jesus Christ. Then she began to kiss her crucifix, and to cross herself, saying these words: 'Even as thy arms, oh Jesus Christ, were spread here upon the cross, so receive me,—so receive me into the arms of thy mercy.'

"Then the two executioners kneeled down unto her, desiring her to forgive them her death. She answered, 'I forgive you with all my heart; for I hope this death shall give an end to all my troubles.'

"They, with her two women helping, began to disrobe her, and then she laid the crucifix upon the stool. One of the executioners took from her neck the Agnus Dei, and she laid hold of it, saying she would give it to one of her women; and withal told the executioner that he should have money for it. Then they took off her chain, she made herself unready with a kind of gladness, and smiling, putting on a pair of sleeves with her own hands, which the two executioners before had rudely pulled off, and with such speed, as if she had longed to be gone out of the world.

"During the disrobing of this queen she never altered her countenance; but smiling, said, she never had such grooms before to make her unready, nor ever did put off her clothes before such company. At length, unattired and unapparelled to her petticoat and kirtle, the two women burst out into a great and pitiful shrieking, crying, and lamentation, crossed themselves, and prayed in Latin. The queen turned towards them, embraced them, and said these words in French, *Ne cry-vous, fay praye pur vous*, and so crossed and kissed them, and bade them pray for her.

"Then with a smiling countenance she turned to her men servants, Melvin and the rest, crossed them, bade them farewell, and to pray for her to the last.

"One of the women having a Corpus Christi cloth, lapped it up three-corner wise, and kissed it, and put it over the face of her queen, and pinned it fast upon the caul of her head. Then the two women departed. The queen kneeled down on

the cushion resolutely, and without any token of fear of death, said aloud, in Latin, the Psalm *In te Domine confido;* then groping for the block, she laid down her head, putting her chain over her back with both hands, which holding there still, had been cut off had they not been espied. Then she laid herself upon the block most quietly, and stretching out her arms and legs, cried out, *In manus tuas, Domine, commendo spiritum meum*, three or four times.

"At last, while one of the executioners held her straitly with one of his hands, and the other gave two strokes with an axe before he did cut off her head, and yet left a little gristle behind.

"She made very small noise, no part stirred from the place where she lay. The executioners lifted up the head, and bade 'God save the queen.' Then her dressing of lawn fell from her head, which appeared as grey as if she had been threescore and ten years old, pulled very short, her face much altered, her lips stirred up and down almost a quarter of an hour after her head was cut off. Then said Mr. Dean, 'So perish all the queen's enemies.' The earl of Kent came to the dead body, and with a lower voice, said, 'Such end happen to all the queen's and gospel's enemies.'

"One of the executioners plucking off her garters, espied her little dog, which had crept under her clothes, which would not be gotten forth but with force; and afterwards would not depart from the dead corpse, but came and laid down between her head and shoulders; a thing much noted. The dog, imbrued in her blood, was carried away and washed, as all things else were that had any blood, save those things which were burned.

"The executioners were sent away with money for their fees, not having any one thing that belonged unto her.

"Afterwards every one was commanded forth to the hall, saving the sheriff and his men, who carried her up into a great chamber, made ready for the surgeons to embalm her, and she was embalmed.

"And thus, I hope, (my very good lord,) I have certified your honour of all actions, matters, and circumstances, as did proceed from her, or any other at her death: wherein I dare promise unto your good lordship (if not in some better or worse words than were spoken I am somewhat mistaken) in matter, I have not any whit offended: howbeit, I will not so justify my duties herein, but that many things might well have been omitted, as not worthy of notice. Yet, because it is your lordship's fault to desire to know all, and so I have certified all, it

is an offence pardonable: so resting at your honour's further commandment, I take my leave, this 11th of February, 1586.

Your Honour's,

In all humble service to command,

R. W."

"This, says Spottiswood, was the end of queen Mary's life; a princess of many rare virtues, but crossed with all the vicissitudes of fortune, which never any did bear with greater courage and magnanimity to the last, after a captivity of nineteen years." Near to her sepulchre at Peterborough, some friend, who mourned in secret her untimely end, affixed the following inscription, in Latin. The author was never known, nor could ever be discovered:—

"Mary, queen of Scotland, daughter of a king, widow of the king of France, kinswoman and next heir to the queen of England, adorned with royal virtues and a princely spirit; having often, but in vain, implored to have the right due to a prince done unto her, the ornament of our age and mirror of princes, by a barbarous and tyrannical cruelty is cut off; and by one and the same infamous judgment, both Mary, queen of Scotland, is punished with death, and all kings living are made liable to the same. A strange and uncouth kind of grave this is, wherein the living are included with the dead: for with the ashes of this blessed Mary, thou shalt know that the majesty of all kings and princes lies here depressed and violated. But because the regal secret doth admonish all kings of their duty, traveller, I will say no more[1]."

"The deep condemnation of her taking off" will for ever remain a stigma on the annals of England, and blast the memory of the maiden queen. Mary Stuart was not Elizabeth's subject, and therefore could not be guilty of treason against her. Elizabeth could not possess any jurisdiction over Mary, who was an independent sovereign,—had been decoyed by false pretences of friendship into her kingdom,—had been perfidiously imprisoned, after the most solemn promises of friendship and protection, which her unfortunate circumstances and nearness of blood loudly called for. This martyred queen was most illustrious for her royal descent, her many heroic virtues, her clemency (for she allowed her subjects the most complete toleration, and disturbed none on the score of religion); for the unrelenting and long enduring persecution which she suffered from her brutal and rebellious nobles, and most turbulent and seditious protestant ministers; her long and

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 357.

cruel imprisonment, first, by her own traitorous subjects, who certainly intended to have murdered her, and next by her treacherous cousin and sister queen, Elizabeth, who actually did murder her; and for the detestable lies, forgeries, and calumnies which have been heaped on her devoted head by the traitors who surrounded her during her life, and which have been repeated as most veritable truths by succeeding historians. This murdered queen was the daughter of a king —was the lineal hereditary queen of Scotland—was queen and dowager of France—and was the undoubted heiress to the crown of England and Ireland, and which her descendants at this moment inherit. Mary Stuart was exalted by her birth above all her contemporaries; and her bitterest enemies have been compelled to allow that she possessed all the accomplishments belonging to her sex, with many transcendant and rare talents. Camden calls her "a lady fixed and constant in her religion, of singular piety towards God, invincible magnitude of mind, wisdom above her sex, and of admirable beauty."

It is a somewhat remarkable and providential circumstance, that Mary outlived the whole of the persecuting faction of her rebellious nobles, and that not one of them died a natural death. One fell by the hand of an assassin, another committed suicide, and the others received the just reward of their many treasons on the scaffold; whilst the secret instigator of all their treasons and rebellions, and at last the open murderer of that innocent queen, lived a solitary life, and died unhappily the last of her name and dynasty. But the good sense of the English nation prevented the calamity of a disputed succession, which her death might have occasioned, by proclaiming immediately and unanimously, on her decease, the son of that same murdered queen, as her just and lineal successor, and whose blood now circulates in almost every crowned head in Europe.

After the legal murder, every thing that Mary's blood had touched was burnt; her body was embalmed, and with solemn mockery buried in the cathedral of Peterborough; but after king James's accession, it was removed to Westminster Abbey[1].

Not one of the bad men that committed the long list of enormities against queen Mary, murdered her husband, and at last usurped her power, died the death of all men: every one came to a violent death, and the inferior actors were all executed by the bloody policy of the chiefs, to prevent their revealing to the world the real perpetrators and instigators of the atrocious

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 357.

murder of king Henry. On the scaffold, every one of the inferior actors in the gunpowder drama laid the guilt on Moray, Morton, Bothwell, and Lethington; they also unanimously acquitted the queen "of being participant or ware thereof." Lord Herries directly accused the earl of Moray of the king's murder, at his own table, and challenged him to single combat; but conscious guilt deterred the regent from accepting. Moray was a man of unbounded ambition, and was by no means scrupulous of the means of attaining his object. He made religion a cloak for his repeated rebellions; and while appearing to be zealous in the support of the protestant religion, he actually robbed the church of much of its property. He was latterly of a suspicious, cruel, tyrannical disposition, as his usage of his sister and sovereign fully shows. She was much attached to him, and trusted implicitly in him; so much so, "that shortly after our sovereign's hame coming fra the realme of France, in Scotland; the earl of Moray having respect then, and as appears yet, by his proceedings, to place himself in the government of this realme, and to usurp the kingdom; by his counsel caused the queen's majesty to become so subject unto him as her grace had been a pupil, in such sort that her highness's subjects had not access unto her grace, to propone their own causes, or to receive answer thereof, but by him only: so that he only was recognosced as prince, and her majesty but a shadow." For his treachery to those who confided in him, and his cruelty to all the queen's loyal adherents, especially the Hamiltons, whom he oppressed and harassed, he became universally hated by the queen's followers, and it is said that he himself became jealous, cruel, and fearful of assassination. His unrelenting persecution of the queen gave Elizabeth that sovereignty over Scotland, which the most warlike and illustrious of her predecessors had never been able to acquire by the sword. He tacitly acknowledged the crown of England to be paramount, by prosecuting an independent sovereign for actions falsely alleged to have been committed within her own dominions, in the courts of a foreign sovereign; and he thereby constituted Elizabeth a judge over the crown of Scotland, which had ever been independent, and owned no superior but God only. Such is the consequence of guilty ambition; a lawful sovereign, however weak or wicked, would never have dishonoured the crown as Moray certainly did, in order to promote his own ambition.

His cruelty and injustice to James Hamilton, of Bothwellhaugh, was the cause of his own untimely end. Hamilton was loyal to his queen, —a crime of the deepest dye in Moray's

estimation; and was taken after the battle of Langside, and sentenced to be hanged, and his estates to be forfeited; but he made his escape. His wife kept possession of Woodhouselee, of which she was the heiress, thinking that the forfeiture only extended to her husband's hereditary property. Moray conferred Woodhouselee on Ballandine, a creature of his own, who took possession of the house, and not only turned the poor woman out of doors, but stript her naked, and left her in that condition in the open fields, in a cold dark night, where, before day, she became furiously mad. Hamilton vowed revenge, and watching an opportunity, he shot the regent through the body, as he rode slowly through Linlithgow; he died shortly after, and had no time to acknowledge his share of the late king's murder. When queen Mary heard in her prison of his cruel murder, she evinced no sign of resentment for the injuries he had done her in her fortune, but, above all, in her reputation, but shed abundance of tears, and protested that "she was heartily sorry that he was taken away so suddenly, before he had, by a serious repentance, expiated his sins against God, his sovereign, and his country."

The duke of Orkney (Bothwell) sailed with a small fleet for the Orkney Islands, pursued by Kirkaldy of Grange. He stood over for Norway, where he fell in with a Turkish vessel, which he attacked; but some Norwegian vessels coming to the Turk's assistance, he was captured in spite of the most determined bravery. The king of Denmark detained him a close prisoner as a common pirate. The regent, Moray, immediately sent commissioners to the court of Denmark, requesting that the duke of Orkney might be delivered up to him, that he might suffer condign punishment for the murder of king Henry. But his Danish majesty, looking on the commissioners as the deputies of rebels and usurpers, replied, "that he knew of no authority they had in Scotland to demand, examine, or condemn any man; and that if their king had been murdered, it was the business of their queen to look to that." Moray was obliged to pocket this affront; and the unfortunate duke, after a tedious and painful confinement of ten years, died in prison. "He was," says Crawford, "one of the handsomest men of his time, well made, and of undoubted courage, though, in his declining fortune, otherwise represented by his adversaries, who forgot that he was unanimously chosen general of their army, when very young, merely on the score of his bravery. He had ever been a constant loyalist, and representing an ancient family which gave him many dependents, he made use of his power in doing consider-

able service to the crown. But being a man *far from a very strict life and conversation*, and relying too much on the successes of his youth, he became at last too forward and ambitious, by which in his riper years he betrayed himself into all the inconveniences that afterwards befel him. That he murdered the king was the universal belief, and it seems to be indisputable; but that Moray and Morton were his associates and sharers in the guilt, is equally undeniable: for, although the former retired from Edinburgh to avoid suspicion, and died without acknowledging his crime, yet the latter, after an impunity of fourteen years, justly lost his head for that detestable murder. The rebels were glad of his escape from Carberry Hill: no man pursued him then, neither did any man offer to attack him at Dunbar, whither he retreated, and remained at least fourteen days, although they issued sham proclamations for his apprehension.' Indeed, if Kirkaldy had taken him at Orkney, it is more than probable that he would have been sacrificed on the spot, to prevent a betrayal of his accomplices. It was confidently reported at that time, by very good men, and many people of reputation and honour, that during his imprisonment in Denmark, and at his death, he often *solemnly protested that the queen was WHOLLY INNOCENT of the murder of her husband;* on which her enemies, to remove the force of so prevalent an evidence, immediately gave it out that he *died mad*. Nevertheless, in four years' time thereafter, her persecutor, the earl of Morton, when he came to the scaffold, was forced, by remorse of conscience, *to do her the same justice, and confirm the words of her dying adversary*[1]."

Kirkaldy of Grange, who betrayed the queen at Carberry Hill, was executed as a traitor by Morton. Lethington committed suicide by swallowing poison. He and Buchanan were the grand forgers of all the spurious letters and sonnets, which were palmed on the world as the genuine productions of the royal martyr.

After a long life of extortion, sacrilege, treasons, and murders, Morton was tried and condemned after James had assumed the reins of government, for the murder of the prince's father, although Elizabeth moved heaven and earth to save his life, lest he should expose that consummation of hypocrisy and savage ferocity which she, in conjunction with her Scottish confederates, had practised against the reputation and life of her unfortunate rival and heiress. Morton confessed to Lawson, and one or two ministers, "That on his return from

[1] Crawford's Mem. 55, 56.

England, whither he had been banished for the murder of secretary Rizzio, Bothwell came to him at Whittingham, and proposed the murder of the king, alleging it was the queen's own desire to have him despatched, as the principal author of Rizzio's death, and desired his (Morton's) assistance in the affair: to which he replied, that if Bothwell would bring it under the queen's own hand, he might then, probably, engage in the business; but that Bothwell often laboured to draw him in, and promised to bring the queen's handwriting; yet *he had never been able to procure any such thing*,—and, if he had, he was determined, even then, to have nothing to do in it. He knew Archibald Douglas, his cousin, was engaged in the murder before it was committed; he told him he had assisted in the execution of the fact[1]." Hollinshed, cited by Guthrie, says, part of Morton's confession was suppressed, "out of tenderness to people now living." The persons so tenderly dealt with, then living, were Elizabeth and her secretary Cecil. This concealment by the ministers who attended his last hours, was to cover the villany of those "people now living," and to continue the false prejudice against queen Mary. Morton confessed also his intention of putting prince James into Elizabeth's power, by sending him, under pretence of education, into England. In consideration of this confession, James changed his sentence from hanging to decollation. Accordingly, his head was struck off by *the maiden*,—an instrument of his own invention.

[1] Crawford's Mem. 74.

CHAPTER X.

THE PRESBYTERIAN ESTABLISHMENT.

1593.—A general fast imposed by a few ministers—the causes.—The first presbyterian general assembly—the king inhibits the meeting—they evade the king's complaints—the king obliged to temporise.—The Assembly assumes a power of legislating in civil causes—the civil and ecclesiastical powers at issue—ecclesiastical tyranny.—Reclamation of the shoemakers.—Submission of the ministers.—The synod of Fyfe excommunicates the popish lords—the king's efforts to save them—ineffectual.—Accidental meeting of the king with the popish lords—the ministers complain against them—pertinacity of the ministers, and perplexity of the king—popish lords condemned.—The king's perplexities between the ministers and the popish lords.——1594.—Birth of a prince.—Bothwell's sedition—embezzlement of public money.—Bothwell's history.—An Assembly—transactions of the kirk—the ministers inhibited from speaking irreverently of the king.—The king demands ecclesiastical censures against Hunter—refused.—Baptism of prince Henry.—Rebellion of the popish lords.——1595.—An Assembly at Montrose—articles proposed by the king.—Death of Chancellor Maitland.—Dearth and scarcity of grain.——1596.—The defections of the kirk.—Calderwood's lamentation.—An Assembly—corruptions of the ministers—a new covenant framed—a list of public sins.—End of the sincere assemblies.—A convention of the estates at Falkland.—Melville's conduct—conference with ministers.—Melville's speech.—Motion for the recal of the banished lords—Bruce's opposition and saucy answer.—Return of the popish lords.—Alarm of the ministers.—Synod of Fyfe excommunicates the lords.—Huntly restored.—Council of the church—summoned the president of the Court of Session—their intolerance—the king's displeasure.—Complaint preferred by the council of the church—the king's answer.—Birth of the princess Elizabeth.—Outrageous conduct of Black, one of the ministers.—The brethren make common cause with Black.—The king's firmness—he denounces the council of the kirk—orders the council to dissolve.—Black banished.—A fast proclaimed.—Riot and assault on the king—his vigorous measures—ministers instigate to a general rebellion.—Bruce's letter to lord Hamilton—conduct of the ministers.——1597.—Consequences of the late sedition.—An Assembly—fifty questions proposed to them—perplexity of the ministers.—The king's measures—Melville's opposition—his nephew's protest.—Proceedings of the Assembly—advantages gained by the king—acts made.—Death of Lesslie, bishop of Ross—succeeded by Lindsay.—An Assembly meet at St. Andrew's—the lawful Assembly meet at Dundee.—Edinburgh divided into parishes.—The king admits Melville to an interview.—Imposition of hands or ordination restored.—Archbishop Bancroft's correspondence with the king—an ecclesiastical council appointed.—A royal visita-

tion of the university of St. Andrew's.—Subjects of Melville's lectures.—Parliament restores the popish peers—petition for restoring the prelates to parliament—act of restoration.——1598.—An Assembly—proposal of sending prelates to parliament—fifty-one persons recommended to be sent.—The king master of the Assemblies.—Melville intrudes into the Assemblies.—Opposition of Bruce to the imposition of hands.—Meeting of commissioners at Falkland—articles agreed on.—Name of bishop to be changed to commissioner of the kirk.—Archbishop Beaton re-appointed to the see of Glasgow.——1599.—Basilikon Doron—excites Melville's wrath.——1600.—Assembly—vacant bishopries filled.—End of the presbyterian establishment.—Death and message of John Dury.—The king's opinion of the brethren.

1593.—In the end of the preceding year, a casual meeting of the ministers, but not an Assembly, imposed an universal fast throughout the kingdom, on their own authority, to be observed on the 17th and 24th of December. The causes of this fast were declared to be "the practices of enemies within and without the country, intending to execute the bloody decrees of the council of Trent; a fearful desolation of the greatest part of the country, perishing in ignorance *through want of pastors* and sufficient means to entertain the word among them, with a carelessness of the magistrates to provide remedy; a fearful defection of all classes to popery and atheism, especially of the nobility, through the resorting and trafficking of jesuits, seminary priests, and other papists, without execution of any law against them: the general disorder of the whole state of the commonwealth, overflowing with all kind of impiety, contempt of God's word, and blasphemy of his name, contempt of the sovereign, treason, shedding of innocent blood, adultery, witchcraft, and other abominable crimes. These causes to be enlarged at the discretion of any brother, according as he shall have sure knowledge and sense of the premises[1]."

Under the self-accusing imputation of this black and fearful catalogue of crimes, the godly brethren held the first purely presbyterian Assembly at Dundee, in the latter end of April. It would appear that they had met on their own authority, without consulting the government, although they had agreed that no Assembly should be called but by the king's authority; for no sooner was the king informed of their convocation, than he despatched sir James Melville, of Halhill, to declare "that he would not suffer the privilege and honour of his crown to be diminished, and Assemblies to be made when and where they pleased. He therefore commanded them to send

[1] Calderwood, p. 271-2.

two or three members, to whom he should communicate his will for the time and place of their next meeting. Sir James was also instructed to direct them to pass an act to inhibit ministers from declaiming in the pulpit against his majesty and council, under pain of deprivation. In regard of Mr. Craig's advanced age, he requested they would nominate six brethren for him to choose a domestic chaplain from the number, in Craig's place,—to appoint some in every presbytery to inform his majesty of the practices of the papists and those who protect the earl of Bothwell, whose whole courses tended to the subversion of all religion, and to the danger of his majesty's person; and that they should examine those who arrive in and depart from the seaports.

By repeated encroachments, the brethren had gained such a dangerous accession of power, that they were very naturally unwilling to part with it, and, accordingly, these articles were either altogether rejected, or else were evaded, in a general reply. The liberty of meeting when and where they pleased was a privilege not to be yielded so easily; they therefore sheltered themselves under the act of parliament passed the preceding year. And as for declaiming in the pulpit, they said, an act of Assembly had been passed, prohibiting "any minister to utter in pulpit any rash or irreverent speeches against his majesty and council or their proceedings; but to give their admonitions upon just and necessary causes, and in all fear, love, and reverence." The king considered this an evasion which would not operate in the slightest degree as any restraint on the ravings of the brethren, who were ever ready to find "a just and necessary cause" for an outpouring of the vials of their wrath on the king and his government. He therefore rejected this act as unsatisfactory; and in consequence of their obstinacy, he paid very little attention to their petitions against the Roman Catholic or associated lords, and against the erection of tithe impropriations into temporal lordships[1].

James had been constrained, much against his inclination, by the pressing necessities of his situation, being exposed to the continual treasonable attempts of Bothwell on the one hand, and the grasping ambition of the brethren on the other, to give the royal sanction to an act of parliament, that declared all who contemned the censures of the church to be outlaws, which armed the ministers with the most formidable and tremendous powers, and they were far from consulting justice or loving mercy in these cases. The heat of their own

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 393.—Calderwood, 285, 286.

intemperate passions, or the most groundless suspicions, were quite sufficient to bring men of the most exalted rank, the purest patriotism, or the most blameless lives, into their presbyterian inquisition, where they lost the whole benefit of civil society, at the caprice of the ministers. But the brethren were now in the very zenith of their glory. "Never," says Petrie, in the exultation of his heart, "had mercy and truth, righteousness and peace, since Christ's coming in the flesh, a more glorious meeting and amiable embracing on earth," than at this crisis. From outlawing, they proceeded next to exercise the power of excommunicating those who would not submit to their domination. They again assumed a legislative power; and on their own authority the Assembly enacted, "that none professing religion within the church of Scotland should from thenceforth repair to any of the king of Spain's dominions, where the tyranny of the Inquisition was used, for traffic of merchandise, or other the like negociations, till the king did obtain liberty from the king of Spain to his subjects for traffic in these bounds, without any danger of their person or goods for the cause of religion, under the pain of excommunication."

The mercantile body were greatly alarmed at this most wanton and mischievous assumption of the powers of government, and petitioned the king and council to be relieved from the cruel tyranny of the presbyterian inquisition. The king was highly incensed at this assumption of his prerogative, and granted the prayer of the merchants' petition immediately. The civil and ecclesiastical powers were now at issue,—the former authorised the merchants to continue their traffic in the face of the anathemas of the Assembly, whilst the latter excommunicated them, whereby they became outlaws, and were rendered liable to lose the protection of the laws both in person and property. Harassed by this inquisitorial tyranny, the merchants offered to cease all trade with Spain, if the godly inquisitors would only allow them so much time as to make up their accounts and receive their balances from their Spanish correspondents[1]. Thus the brethren cramped and destroyed the commerce and resources of the country, and exercised a moral tyranny over the minds and consciences of their oppressed people, more insupportable than even the gloomy oppression of the Spanish inquisition. Not satisfied with destroying the foreign trade of the kingdom, they next proceeded to level the thunders of the Assembly, by their own usurped

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 393.—Calderwood.—Guthrie, viii. 310.

authority, on the domestic commerce. They passed an act for abolishing the weekly market of Edinburgh, then held on Monday; but the shoemakers excited a riot against them, and menaced them with personal chastisement and banishment from the city, if they should persevere in this obnoxious measure. The brethren, who acknowledged that they had received their mission from the people, readily acquiesced in the will of their masters, cancelled the act, and allowed the market to continue to be held on Monday as usual. This victory of the mob over the ministers gave great satisfaction at court, and excited much merriment; the good-natured king asserting "that rascals and souters [shoemakers] could obtain at the ministers' hands what the king could not in matters more reasonable[1]." But had the king possessed less of the "milk of human kindness," he might have obtained all his reasonable demands: had he curbed the licentious zeal of these brethren, and made some severe examples, there is no doubt but that he might have saved himself much trouble and many insults, and the country, both then and since, much guilt and misery.

In July, the associated popish lords had been cited before parliament, but in consequence of some informality in the citation their case was remitted to the king and council. On this, the brethren took alarm, as if the church of Rome had been on the point of re-establishment; and in October, the synod of Fife met in St. Andrews, and summarily excommunicated the earls of Errol, Huntly, and Angus, the lord Hume, and sir James Chisholm. "The said synod," says Calderwood, "in name and authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, did cut off the said persons *from their communion*, and delivered them to Satan to the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be safe, if it so please God to reclaim them by true repentance; otherwise, to their just everlasting condemnation; and ordaineth intimation to be made hereof by every one of the brethren in their kirks immediately, with interdiction that none presume to receive them within their houses, or have any dealings, fellowship, or society with the said excommunicate persons; with certification, that the contraveners shall incur the like censure, sentence, and judgment[2]." This is in the very worst spirit of popery; and one of the well known marks of the beast is here clearly developed, which forbids all traffic with heretics or excommunicated parties. In the Roman church, none are permitted to buy or sell, except those who are implicated in the predicted blasphemy or apostacy with which the man of sin has

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 391. [2] Calderwood, p. 291.

tainted the Roman Church. "He causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive the mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads; and that *no man might buy or sell*, save he that had the name or the mark of the beast, or the number of his name. *Here is wisdom*," but it is the wisdom of the serpent without the innocence of the dove. There seems, however, to have been but little "wisdom" on the part of the presbyterians; for these noblemen neither lived within the jurisdiction of this synod, nor belonged to their communion. The synod addressed letters to all the presbyteries, but especially to that of Edinburgh, desiring them to publish their act of excommunication. Notwithstanding his utmost efforts, the king was unable to prevent its proclamation in the kirk, although he condescended to argue with the ministers, and confounded them with two flagrant informalities: 1st, that these noblemen were not subject to their synod: and 2d, that they had not been formally cited to answer.

Highly incensed at the tyrannical conduct of the synod of Fife, the king sent for Robert Bruce, one of the city ministers, and represented to him the injustice and informality of this most wanton sentence, and commanded him to defer its publication: "For," said the king, "these persons were neither subject to the synod of Fife, nor were they cited to answer; and if this be your order, that the ministers of one synod may excommunicate, and at their desire, all the rest shall make intimation, who shall be secure, or how shall it be eschewed, but that numbers shall in this way be brought into trouble?" Bruce bluntly answered his majesty, "that it was not in his power to stay the publication, the brethren having already concluded the same; and that the ministers of Fife had their own reasons, and were answerable only to the General Assembly." "Well," said the king, "I could have no rest till ye got what ye call the discipline of the church established; now seeing I have found it abused, and that none among ye hath power to stay such disorderly proceedings, I will think of a mean to help it[1]."

The king made a progress to Jedburgh, to suppress the usual licentious liberties of the borderers; and at Falla, the excommunicated lords threw themselves in the king's way, entreating his protection against the tender mercies of the brethren. The king recommended them to retire to Perth, and there wait the issue of a trial. This accidental circumstance coming to the ears of the brethren, they despatched messengers to the king,

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 397.

with violent complaints against himself and the associated lords, whom they denounced as traitors and outlaws. They demanded that their trial might not be precipitated, till the professors of religion, who had determined on being their prosecutors, had time to prepare their accusation; "being resolved," said they, "if they should all lose their lives in one day, if they continue enemies to God and his truth, that the country should not bruik them and us together." The king, much irritated at the insolence of the brethren, declared "that he would not acknowledge their convention, nor their missives for commissioners, seeing they had assembled themselves without his knowledge." The commissioners stuck to their point; and insisted on treating with the king as an independent legal body, but which he peremptorily refused. After much altercation, his majesty condescended to hear the ministers *as subjects*, but *not* as the *representatives* of a commission of the kirk. He assured the zealous brethren that his meeting with the associated lords was purely accidental, and that as they had solicited a trial, he could not of his princely duty refuse it, and moreover, that he was determined that justice should be indifferently administered[1]. May we be here allowed to say, that, as James was alike the sovereign of both the Roman Catholic lords and of the godly brethren, he was of "his princely duty" bound to minister justice indifferently to each of them, and that the former were better entitled to protection and justice, than the latter were to the gratification of their satanical and malignant passions. The result of this mission gave mighty umbrage to the presbyterian ministers, who, in accordance with their fundamental principle of resistance to the powers that be, resolved to assemble in arms at the place of trial, and become the prosecutors. When the king challenged them for this disloyal and pugnacious conduct, they excused themselves by alleging, "that it was the cause of God, and in defence thereof they could not be deficient." To prevent this, the king issued a proclamation, prohibiting all convocations of the subjects in arms, and commanded the brethren to remain peaceably at home. Nevertheless, the ministers collected a large force of armed men from all parts of the country; and six of the brethren were associated with the judges, and, as might be expected, the popish lords were condemned[2].

The earl of Angus was committed close prisoner to Edinburgh Castle, but made his escape; and the earls of Huntly and Errol were cited to appear before the king and privy

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 397-8. [2] Ibid. 400.

council; but not appearing, they were denounced as rebels. Nevertheless, says Calderwood, "The godly were not content with the favour granted by this act to the excommunicated earls," and certain ministers were desired "to crave, that their persons may be warded, before there were any further proceeding or any favour granted unto them." In March, the king made a progress northward, accompanied by some military, and demolished the castles of Slaines, Strathbogie, Newton, Burnhouse, and Craigie, belonging to the popish recusants, the earls of Errol and Huntly, Sir Walter Lindsay, and Sir John Oglevie. Parliament met on the 21st July, and ratified the forfaultryc f that arch-traitor, the earl of Bothwell. On the 11th of October, the popish lords were reconciled to the king. "This year is most observable in respect the king was tossed like a tennis-ball betwixt the precise ministers and the treacherous papists, in respect when, as he had cast down and demolished some of their houses, and committed other some of them to prison, and exiled others; and in effect done all that lay in him to do; yet Mr. Robert Bruce, a minister, told him to his face out of the pulpit, 'that God would raise more Bothwells against him than one;' that was more enemies than Bothwell, if he did not revenge God's quarrel against the papists, before his own particular, and repented him not of his own trespasses and iniquities[1]."

1594.—On the 19th of February, the queen was delivered at Stirling of a son. Lord Souche arrived as ambassador from Elizabeth, to complain of the king's favour to the popish lords. He commenced an intrigue immediately with the notorious Bothwell, who was again engaged in sedition, and also with some of the brethren, who, both in their private conversation and public sermons, openly encouraged the people to enlist under the standard of that chosen son of presbytery, to whom the brethren sent one Andrew Hunter to attend upon him as his chaplain. Neither was this all. There had been a collection made in all the churches for the poor saints of Geneva, who were then in trouble, and this money was deposited with James Melville for the purpose of being remitted; but, in the abundance of their zeal to stir up strife and sedition, instead of sending it to Geneva, they paid it over to two of Bothwell's captains to raise soldiers for his service, that he might embroil the kingdom in rebellion! The king discovered the ambassador's intrigues, and dismissed him without vouchsafing him an audience.

[1] Balfour's Annals, i. 393—315.

It may be as well to dismiss Bothwell at once. In the year 1592, he made an attempt to seize the king's person at Falkland; but his co-conspirators not keeping their appointment, he was disappointed, and again retired under Elizabeth's protection, who negociated through lord Borough for his return and reception into favour. The king peremptorily refused to receive such a notorious traitor; but some of his confederates in the household introduced Bothwell and another conspirator into the king's bed-chamber, with their swords drawn and a force behind them, who kept the king in custody until he had granted their desires. By the mediation of the English ambassador and some of the city ministers, who were engaged in the plot, the king was forced to agree "that pardon should be given to Bothwell and his accomplices for all matters past; and that this matter should be ratified by act of parliament in November following: that in the meantime the lord chancellor, lord Hume, the master of Glammis, and sir George Hume, who were supposed to favour the popish lords, should be excluded from court. And finally, that Bothwell and all his party should be held as good subjects." These conditions were extorted from the king on the 14th August, 1593, but were declared void by a convention of the estates held at Stirling on the 7th September following. Bothwell naturally resented this decision of the estates, and created some disturbance, but which was soon quelled. He was cited to appear before the privy council at Edinburgh, which he failed to do, and was in consequence denounced a rebel, which only animated him to fresh sedition. The English ambassador gave him secret encouragement and assistance, and he prepared new forces, under pretence of banishing the popish lords; "but, in truth, to make the king of no signification in the power of government." He took possession of Leith, at the head of 400 horse; but the trained citizens of Edinburgh charged him before he had effected a junction with the forces of the other conspirators, and completely routed and dispersed his followers. Elizabeth now became sensible of the infamy which she had incurred by protecting such an incorrigible and infamous rebel, and she issued a proclamation prohibiting any of her subjects from harbouring or assisting him. The kirk also seeing that since his last defeat he was no longer able to serve their purposes, in keeping the king and government in continual agitation, ordered the ministers in all places to dissuade their people from joining with him in any of his insurrections. The continual personal danger in which this traitor kept the king, reduced him to comply with the unreasonable

demands of the kirk, and to establish their discipline for his own preservation. But his treachery to the kirk in trafficking with the popish lords, at the very time that he was supposed to be acting most zealously in their cause, tended to alienate the support of his most ardent friends and supporters among the presbyterian ministers. He was now reduced to the last extremity. Elizabeth had proclaimed and disowned him, and the kirk had excommunicated him for having joined with the popish lords. He was betrayed by his own party, who impeached his brother Hercules, who was executed in Edinburgh, and being shut out from England, he fled to France, where he met with rough treatment: he then moved on to Spain, where his heretical tenets rendered him obnoxious to the inquisition, and he was at last obliged to retreat to Naples, where he dragged out the short remnant of his days in contempt, disease, and beggary[1].

On the 7th May, the General Assembly met at Edinburgh, and Andrew Melville was chosen moderator. The sentence of excommunication pronounced by the Fife synod against the popish lords, was confirmed and ratified, and ordered to be published in every parish. A committee was nominated to admonish the king of the dangers of the realm, eleven in number, with as many remedies, suitable, in their judgment, to the emergency. The king made little objection to the remedies, except to the seventh,—"that the subjects be charged to put themselves in arms by all good means, and be in readiness to pursue and defend, as they shall be warned by his majesty, or otherwise, *on urgent occasions*." To this suspicious looking article James replied.—"To be ready at my charge is very meet, but I understand not the last clause of *urgent occasions*[2]." He therefore peremptorily rejected this license; and, indeed, if it had been granted, the subjects would soon have wrested the sword out of his hands; for who was to be judge of these "*urgent occasions*" but the subjects themselves, hounded on by the pugnacious brethren?

The king sent sir Robert Melville and Mr. Hume, with instructions to the Assembly: one of which was, that they "should inhibit the ministers from uttering any irreverent speeches in pulpit against his majesty's person, council, or estate, under the pain of deprivation." This warning was occasioned by the conduct of a minister named John Ross, who, in a sermon preached at Perth, had given utterance to some

[1] Heylin's Hist. of Presbyterians, lib. ix. pp. 331, 332.—Balfour's Annals.
[2] Spottiswood, b. vi. 1.5.—Calderwood, 302, 303.

most irreverent and indecent invectives against the king; who now desired that the said Ross should be censured as his fault deserved. The king had often required this external decency to be observed, but without success, for the bringing of railing accusations against the king and his nobility seemed to have been one of the elements of the new religion. All the satisfaction, therefore, which they afforded to his majesty, was an admonition to Ross to speak more reverently for the time to come, so as he might give *no just cause* of complaint; which was rather an encouragement to proceed in the same uncharitable course, than an authoritative censure. This nicety stands in violent contrast to the vindictive and never-ceasing tenacity with which they pursued any one who offended against their own discipline, or against whom they adopted any prejudice. The king also demanded the punishment of excommunication to be pronounced against Andrew Hunter, one of their own brethren, whom they themselves had appointed chaplain to Bothwell, and with whose assistance they had maintained a treasonable correspondence with that arch-traitor. He craved this doom from them, "for the scandal he had brought upon their profession, he being the first open traitor of their function against a christian king of their own religion, and their natural sovereign." But their own traffic with Hunter had been too considerable to allow them to sacrifice him for treason; they therefore excused themselves from the process of excommunication, but they deposed him from the ministry as a *deserter of his flock*, and as one *suspected* of having joined himself with the king's rebels. The Assembly were more complaisant to the king upon the third article that he ordered to be presented to them, which was, "that ministers should be ordained by an act of Assembly to dissuade their flocks, both by public and private exhortation, from concurring with Bothwell in his treasonable attempts, or *with any other* that should make insurrection against the authority established by God in his majesty's person." This demand, which conveyed a severe reproach upon their principles, was conceded, and an act was made to the desired effect.

On the 30th of August, the young prince was baptized by David Cunningham, titular bishop of Aberdeen, in the chapel royal, Stirling, and his titles were proclaimed Henry Frederick, knight and baron of Renfrew, lord of the Isles, earl of Carrick, duke of Rothsay, Prince and Steward of Scotland. Special ambassadors were present from the courts of England, Denmark, Brunswick, Mecklenburgh, and the United Provinces. A chair of state was reserved for an ambassador

from France, but no representative of that power made his appearance. His *godfathers* were the king of Denmark, the duke of Mecklenburgh, and the estates of the Netherlands, by a commission sent to their ambassador at the court of Holirood House. Queen Elizabeth was his godmother, and was represented by her ambassador, the earl of Sussex. Money was thrown from the palace windows among the populace, the ambassadors were royally feasted, and the same day a number of knights were created[1].

The peace of the kingdom was broken by the rebellion of the popish lords in October, who defeated the earl of Argyle, the king's lieutenant, that had been sent against them, with considerable slaughter, in Glenlivet, a valley of the Spey lying south of the hill called Belrinnes. On receiving information of the total route of his lieutenant's forces, the king collected some troops and went himself at their head, and drove the rebel lords into the fastnesses of Caithness[2].

1595.—The arch-traitor Bothwell still continued, at the instigation of the brethren, grievously to torment the king with sedition and bloodshed. In the month of June the General Assembly met at Montrose, where, as usual, there was much altercation between the brethren and the king's commissioners,—the spirit of resistance to the king's authority being the foundation of all their proceedings, and which produced its natural fruits of sedition and strife. The royal commissioners urgently pressed the following articles:—1. Whoever did meddle or practise any treasonable enterprise against his majesty's person and estates, being found and declared culpable by law, they should likewise incur the sentence of excommunication, that so there might be an inseparable union betwixt the two swords.—2. That no excommunication should be pronounced at the appetite of particular men, but that a sufficient number of the church should be first assembled, and the same determined by public consent.—3. That none should be excommunicated for civil causes, crimes of light importance, or particular wrongs of ministers, lest the censure should fall into contempt, and become like the pope's cursing.—4. That no summary excommunication should be thenceforth used, but that lawful citation of parties should go before in all causes whatsoever. The first and second were conditionally granted; but to the third and fourth they requested time for deliberation till next assembly, and they discharged, in the mean-

[1] Balfour's Annals, i. 396.—Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 406.
[2] Balfour's Annals, i. 397.

time, the exercise of summary excommunications, unless the church and state were in imminent danger. The king was mightily displeased at this exception, which he thought would be a sufficient warrant for the turbulent and seditious at any time to resort to extreme measures[1].

The lord chancellor Maitland died this year, on whom the king wrote an elegant epitaph in verse. Balfour says, he was "a resolute, wise, and learned man as any in his time, and had been chancellor some ten years, from the parliament of Linlithgow to this year[2]." It was in consequence of his guilty participation in the murder of the earl of Moray, that presbytery received an establishment; but bloodshed in those days was looked upon as a matter of course. A great scarcity afflicted the kingdom, occasioned entirely by the family feuds and wars with which it was devastated from one end to the other, whereby agriculture was prevented, and the fruits of the earth were destroyed in wanton barbarity. "This year was, by the vulgar people, reckoned among the ill years, because of the dearth and scarcity of corn, which the abundance of winds in the harvest time had caused. Yet, for the *bloodshed and slaughters* committed in all quarters of the country, was it *more justly to be so accounted*[3]." The price of grain reached the highest amount that had ever been known previous to that time, and that, too, at the harvest time, when grain ought to have been cheapest[4].

1596.—The natural consequence of breaking loose from the former government was daily appearing with a fearful increase, which was manifested in seditious and treasonable combinations among the laity, and the most indecent railings of the brethren in their pulpits against the king and his government. Even "the sincerest kirk in the world" was not entirely free from pollution; for Calderwood laments its defections and backslidings with exquisite pathos: "This year," says he, "is a remarkable year to the kirk of Scotland, both for the beginning and for the end of it. This kirk was now come to the greatest purity it had ever attained unto, so that her beauty was admirable to foreign kirks. But the devil, envying the happiness and laudable proceedings of the ministry and Assemblies of the kirk, stirred up both papists and politicians to disturb her peace. The papists perceived there was no rest for them in Scotland, if the authority of the kirk continued. Politicians feared that their craft and trade, which is to use indifferently

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 406.—Calderwood, 308.
[2] Spottiswood, b. vi. 405.—Annals, i. 397.
[3] Spottiswood, b. vi. 404. [4] Balfour's Annals, i. 398.

all men and means to attain unto their own ends, and to set themselves up, as it were, in the throne of Christ, should be undone. Whereas, at her earnest desire, the apostate earls, Angus, Huntly, and Errol, were forfaulted for an unnatural and treasonable conspiracy with the Spaniards, and were expelled out of the country, and she was now setting herself to reform whatsoever abuses and corruptions were seen in her members, and against the re-entry and restoration of the said earls; but was forced, by craft and policy of politicians and dissembled papists, to take herself to the defence of her own liberties, and of that *holy discipline*, which was her bulwark, and to desist from farther opposition to the re-entry of the excommunicated earls: for some thorny questions, in points of discipline, were devised, whereby *her authority was, in many points, called in doubt*. Ministers were called before the council, to give an account of their rebukes in sermons, and to underlye their censure. The ministers of the kirk in Edinburgh were forced to lurk; and that kirk, which was *a watch-tower*, and shined as a lamp to the rest, was darkened, and no less danger appeared to threaten the rest. In a word, in the end of this year *began a fearful decay and declining of this kirk*, which continued long, proceeding from *worse to worse;* so that the godly did see greater corruption nor ever they looked to have seen in their days[1]."

The General Assembly met in March, and debated long on the corruptions of all estates; but it was especially found that the corruptions of the ministers themselves were so great, as to render inquiry, both into their offices, lives, and manners, absolutely necessary. In consequence, the Assembly appointed a day of humiliation for reconciling themselves to God, and to avert his wrath, "particularly on account of the offences of the king's house, in the court and in the judgment seats." On account of the continual backslidings of the kirk, a new covenant was framed "for the better discharge of their duties, and for reconciling themselves to God;" as it was discovered that all their bands and covenants had only led them farther and farther from the truth. They were constantly patching up presbytery with some new covenant or scheme, to preserve the glory of the holy discipline. "This is the covenant that by some is so often objected to, and said to be violated by those that gave obedience to the canons of the church, albeit there is not a word or syllable that sounds, either to confirming the church government then in use, or to

[1] Calderwood, p. 311.

the rejecting that which since then hath been established. But when other arguments fail them, somewhat must be said to entertain the conceits of the popular. By this covenant all did bind themselves to abide in the profession of the truth, and to walk in the same as God should enable them. But for the rules of policy or ceremonies, serving to good order or decency, let inspection be taken of the register which is extant, and it shall plainly appear that, at the time, there was not so much as any mention made thereof[1]."

This Assembly recounted a most horrible list of crimes, of the most inhuman and unnatural sort, which overspread the whole kingdom. They openly accused the judges of selling justice, and of the most grievous oppression of the poor. Bloodshed, adultery, and fornication, always held the most prominent places in all the black catalogue of sins of which the ministers complained. But on this occasion they produced a new item; viz. "*sacrilegious* persons, as abbots, priors, *dumb* bishops, voting in parliament in the name of the kirk, which is contrary to the laws of the country, whereby the cause of the kirk is dammified[2]." The sacrilegious desecration of the ecclesiastical property began now to appear; "for lack of provision, and sufficient stipends for pastors, the people lie together, ignorant of their salvation and duty to God and the king, whereby atheism, and all kinds of vice, overfloweth the land, there being about *four hundred parish kirks destitute* of the ministry of the word[3]." This is surely a humbling confession of the "admirable beauty and purity that this kirk had attained unto;" "the devil" had little occasion to "envy it." Such spots in the feasts of charity; such gainsayings of Core; clouds without water; such raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame, and which threw up mire and dirt, must have given him supreme delight. Instead of moving Satan's envy, such confusion and evil work must have been as health to his navel, and marrow to his bones. After giving vent as above to his lamentation over the defections and backslidings of the kirk, Calderwood devotes a distinct line to denote, thus, that

"HERE END THE SINCERE GENERAL ASSEMBLIES OF THE KIRK OF SCOTLAND[4]."

The king held a convention at Falkland on the 12th of August, when the recal of the banished lords was debated. Some ministers were ordered to attend; but Andrew Melville

[1] Spottiswood, p. 416. [2] Calderwood, p. 320. [3] Ibid.
[4] Calderwood's True History, p. 323.

went there without any warrant, as a commissioner from the Assembly. When the ministers were called by name into the king's presence, Melville bluntly entered first, for which intrusion the king checked him. Says Melville, "Sir, I have a calling to come here from Christ and his kirk, who have special interest in this turn, and against whom this convention is assembled directly. I charge you and your estates, in the name of Christ and his kirk, that ye favour not his enemies, whom he hateth, nor go about to call home and make citizens of those who have traitorously sought to betray their native country to the cruel Spaniard, to the overthrow of Christ's kingdom." His majesty was indignant at this insolent and unwarrantable intrusion, and ordered him to withdraw; on which he retired, thanking God that he had had an opportunity of disburdening his conscience in the cause of the kirk.

The king and privy council determined on recalling the Roman Catholic lords, at which the brethren took alarm; and the commission of the General Assembly met at Cupar, and appointed a deputation to wait on the king at Falkland, to deprecate this measure. James Melville, a man of a mild disposition, addressed the king; but his majesty interrupted him, and denounced their late meeting at Cupar as unwarrantable, and blamed the whole body of the brethren for their silly fears and unjust suspicions of his sincerity. This inflamed the irritable temper of Andrew Melville, who rudely seizing the king by the sleeve, called him "God's silly vassal," and then addressed him in a rude and intemperate speech, as follows:—"Sir, we will always reverence your majesty in public; but, since we have this occasion to be with your majesty in private, and since you are brought into extreme danger, both of your life and crown, and along with you the country and church of God are like to go to wreck for not telling you the truth and giving you faithful council,—we must discharge our duty, or else be traitors both to Christ and you. Therefore, sir, as divers times before I have told you, so now again I must tell you, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland: there is Jesus Christ, the king of the church, whose subject king James VI. is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. Those whom Christ has called and commanded to watch over his church, and govern his spiritual kingdom, have sufficient power and authority from him to do this, both jointly and severally: the which no christian king or prince should control or discharge, but fortify and assist, otherwise they are not faithful subjects of Christ, and members of his church. Sir, when you were

in your swaddling-clothes, Christ Jesus reigned freely in this land, in spite of all his enemies. His officers and ministers convened and assembled for the ruling and welfare of his church, which was ever for your welfare, defence, and preservation, when these same enemies were seeking your destruction and cutting off." James was obliged to temporise with these furious zealots, and to promise that the noblemen should not be recalled; but the brethren retired from this conference, dissatisfied, as usual, with the king's sincerity, and accusing him of a decided leaning to popery. But surely no sober christian of the present day can defend such an assumption of the worst spirit of popery.

From Elizabeth's great age, James was in daily expectation of succeeding to the throne of England, and he was very desirous of leaving his native kingdom in peace; but as nothing could be accomplished without consent of the brethren, he consulted Robert Bruce, one of the city ministers, respecting the recal of the banished lords, that they might be reconciled by reason and argument to embrace the religion then established by law. Bruce gave a sort of half consent to recal Errol and Angus, but would not listen to any terms in favour of Huntly. The king, anxious that Huntly should be included, desired Bruce to consider of his proposals till the next day, but Bruce was still immoveable, and replied to the king, who insisted on treating the exiles alike, with his usual insolence, "Sir, I see your resolution is to take Huntly into favour, which, if you do, I will oppose, and you shall choose whether you shall lose Huntly or me, for both of us you cannot keep!" The king was so disgusted with this insolence, that he ever after disliked Bruce. These persecuted noblemen, however, ventured to return without formal leave, which created such an alarm among the brethren, that they appointed the first Sunday of December as a day of fasting and humiliation, for the danger that thereby threatened religion. The earl of Huntly, who had been concealed amongst his friends and tenants in the north, sent a petition to James, to be allowed to remain, and resume his station, offering, at the same time, to give security for keeping the king's peace. The king said, after hearing the petition, that longer continuance in the state in which the popish lords were at present was neither consistent with the safety of religion nor his own honour. It was his anxious desire to bring them to the profession of the truth, and to extend his clemency towards them; but he insisted on hav-

[1] Spottiswood, p. 417.

ing better security for the peaceable behaviour of Huntly than he had offered, and stricter conditions. The convention approved of his majesty's judgment, and remitted the imposition of the conditions to the king and council and this arrangement was afterwards confirmed by another convention of estates, which met at Dumfermline[1]. But the real or affected alarm of the presbytery was not yet allayed; the zealous brethren of Fife convoked the commission of the General Assembly, to which the synods throughout the kingdom sent deputies, when a memorial of the danger that threatened the kingdom was drawn up, and transmitted to the several presbyteries, recommending them to excommunicate the Roman Catholic peers. The exiles, not being members of their church, could not be cut off from it, and excommunicating them only exhibits that vindictive spirit which actuated the ministers, because it involved the peers in civil penalties fatal to their property. They next nominated a certain number of ministers from different places, to sit in Edinburgh, and to form the COUNCIL OF THE CHURCH, to sit perpetually; to collect information and transmit it to the presbyteries; to assume the royal prerogative of convoking the General Assembly if their jealous fears should fancy it necessary to meddle in all civil matters, whether connected with "Christ's kingdom" or otherwise; and to watch over their now falling polity.[2] The first act of this illegal and unconstitutional body was to summon lord Seton, the president of the Court of Session, before them, for holding communication with the earl of Huntly; and it is to be regretted that he so far recognised their usurped powers as to appear and condescend to clear himself from their accusation, but, upon promising obedience, they acquitted him[3].

James naturally became alarmed at this *imperium in imperio*, this conclave of presbyterian pontiffs. He sent several privy councillors, to endeavour to negociate with them for a reconciliation with the banished lords, but to no purpose: the ministers asserted, "that in their judgment, and by God's law, they *deserved death*, and could neither be lawfully pardoned nor restored; and if the king and council should take on them to do it, they should answer to God and the country, but for them they would give no consent." There is much of a persecuting spirit in this reply, and there is little doubt, if the secular arm had been as tyrannical as the spiritual, the popish lords would have been consigned to the stake. The commis-

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 417. [2] Spottiswood.—Calderwood [3] Spottiswood, b. vi. 418.

sioners reminded the tyrannical Council "that the bosom of the church should always be patent to returning sinners." The ministers promptly replied, "that the church indeed could not refuse their satisfaction, if it were truly offered; nevertheless, the king stood obliged to do justice." When these godly watchmen could, by no sober arguments, be persuaded to yield in their severity against the Roman Catholic lords, the commissioners broke up the conference, and reported the stubborn pertinacity of the supreme "Council of the church:" "the king was greatly commoved, inveighing against the ministers at his table, in council, and everywhere." Provoked to the last extremity, he declaimed against the brethren, their holy discipline, and their doctrine. The more sober and rational part of the ministry foresaw the evils that this contention would produce, and advised that most unconstitutional and unwarrantable body, "the Council of the church," to wait on the king, and deprecate his displeasure. To their excuses his majesty peremptorily answered, "that there could be no agreement so long as the marches of the two jurisdictions were not distinguished; that in their preachings they censured the affairs of the state and council, convocated Assemblies without his license, concluded what they thought good,—not one desiring his allowance and approbation; and in their synods, presbyteries, and particular sessions, meddled with every thing on *colour* of scandal; and, in consequence, it was vain to think of any agreement, or that the same being made, it could stand and continue any time[1]."

The ministers were unable to answer the king; therefore they blinked the question altogether, and immediately fell to complain of the favour shewn to the popish lords at the late conventions of Falkland and Dunfermline—the invitation given to the countess of Huntly to be present at the princess's baptism—the putting the princess into the hands of the lady Livingston, who was an avowed and obstinate papist—and last, though not the least, "the alienation of his majesty's heart from the ministers, as appeared by all his speeches, both in public and private." In reply, the king said, very truly, that "they had given him too just cause, by *railing* against him and his proceedings, privately and in their sermons. He had granted nothing to the popish lords but what the estate had found needful for the peace and quiet of the realm. He esteemed the lady Huntly a good and discreet lady, and worthy of his countenance, and that she was a papist they might

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 417-19.

blame themselves, who had never taken care to inform her of the truth. Lastly, he had entrusted his daughter, the princess, to the lord Livingston, a nobleman known to be of good religion, and not to his lady, who should not be suffered to take any care of her unless she conformed in point of religion[1]."

On the 19th August, the queen was delivered of a daughter at Stirling, who was baptized on the 28th November, in the Chapel Royal, Holyrood House. She received the christian name of ELIZABETH, and on the 14th February, 1615, she was married, at the age of 17, at Whitehall, to Frederick V. count palatine of the Rhine, to whom she bore eight sons and five daughters; the youngest of whom, SOPHIA, was declared successor to the crown of Great Britain, and whose son, the elector of Hanover, afterwards succeeded, by the title of GEORGE I.[2]

Whilst animosities and contentions were disgracing the brethren, and producing the most mischievous feuds between the civil and the ecclesiastical powers, which at that period were by no means well defined or understood by either party, a new subject of contention arose, which embroiled the whole ministry, for the brethren made it a party cause. David Black, one of the ministers of St. Andrews, in a sermon full of sedition and incendiary matter, railed in the most scurrilous and malignant manner on the king and queen, saying, "that all kings were the devil's bairns, and the heart of king James was full of treachery." He charged his majesty with conniving at the return of the popish lords, by which duplicity he said he "detected the treachery of his heart." He next attacked the bench, and called the judges "miscreants and bribers;" of the nobility, he said they were "degenerate, godless dissemblers, and enemies to the church;" and in the fury of his seditious harangue, "he called the queen of England an atheist, and a woman of no religion." In all periods of the world there have been good-natured individuals who have a malicious pleasure in communicating things of a mischievous tendency; and it was not long before the subject of this sermon was brought under the notice of the English ambassador, who immediately complained to the king of this insult on his sovereign. The king cited Black to answer for the expressions used in his sermon, before the privy council. Andrew Melville accompanied Black, and sounded the tocsin of alarm to the whole brethren, as if the king had been determined to bring their doctrine under his immediate control. In consequence,

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 419. [2] Balfour's Annals.—British Peerage.

the whole of the brotherhood made common cause with Black; and the Council of the church exerted every effort to protect and screen him from deserved punishment. Robert Pont, senator of the College of Justice, and titular bishop of Caithness, protested solemnly against the king's interference with their doctrines taught from the pulpit; but in the case of Black it was *not doctrine* that was inquired into, but the *seditious and treasonable* language which he had used. Black denounced the whole charge as "false, untrue, and calumnious," and asserted that "speeches delivered in pulpit, albeit alleged to be treasonable, could not be judged by the king, till the church first took cognition thereof! but as he did not come there to solve questions," he declined answering; and he rejected at same time the king and council as judges. The brotherhood protested that they would oppose the king's authority of judging treasonable matter in their discourses "so long as they had breath." It was to no purpose that the king declared he had no intention of abridging the church's liberties, or impairing their spiritual jurisdiction; no asseveration could assuage the jealousy of the brethren, neither did the king's most solemn assurances ever meet with the slightest credence. He said, "This licentious discoursing of affairs of state in the pulpit cannot be tolerated. My claim is only to judge in matters of sedition and other civil and criminal causes, and of speeches that may import such crimes, wheresoever they be uttered; for that the pulpit should be a place *privileged*, and under colour of doctrine, people stirred up to sedition, no good man, I think, will allow. If treason and sedition be crimes punishable when they are committed, much more if they be committed in the pulpit, where the word of truth only should be taught and heard." The brethren contended that as their commission was from God, "the same ought not to be controled in any civil judicature." The lordly successor of St. Peter, in the plenitude of his power, could not have made a more extravagant claim for the supremacy of the keys over the sword. "Would you keep your commission," said the king, "there would be no strife; but I trust your commission be not to rule estates."

This seditious obstinacy obliged the king to publish a proclamation, in which he recapitulated the many and increasing encroachments on his authority of the newly-erected tribunal, "The Council of the Kirk"; in convoking the subjects as if they had no lord or superior over them, whereby the ministers were constantly deserting their flocks to attend on this council. He therefore commanded the members of this body to dissolve themselves, to repair immediately to their respective

charges, and not to meet again in this unlawful council under pain of rebellion. By another proclamation he strictly prohibited all noblemen and gentlemen from joining or assisting this council. He offered to withdraw his action against Black, if the kirk would waive the declinature which all the presbyterian party had signed; but the ministers, confident in their own supposed strength, refused to waive it, or declare it to be simply a general and not a particular declinature. They answered, therefore, "That both their pulpits and their preachers too should be totally exempted from the king's authority; and that they were resolved to stand to their declinature unless the king would entirely remit Black's and all similar cases to the *ecclesiastical judge*; and that no minister should be charged for his preaching, at least before the meeting of the next General Assembly, *which should be in their own power to call as they saw occasion*." This answer incensed the king, and he again peremptorily charged the commissioners of the kirk to leave the capital immediately; and Black was cited to appear before the privy council on the last of November. The king alleged most truly, "that certain persons of the ministry abiding in the town of Edinburgh had of long time continued together *devising plots* prejudicial to his majesty's authority, and *usurping* a power over their brethren[1]." This decisive step filled the pulpits with the most indecent railing and invectives against the king and privy council; and as the latter body could by no means bring the brethren to acknowledge the king's civil jurisdiction, nor Black to confess the seditious language he had uttered, he was sentenced to banishment beyond the river Spey. Immediately the ministers proclaimed a national fast, to be observed, as their usual custom was, on the weekly festival of Sunday, "for the wrongs done to Christ's kingdom," meaning in the person of Black, "and which they opposed with the spiritual armour given them by Christ;" on which day "the doctrine sounded powerfully;" that is, the ministers uttered the most furious invectives against government, and excited the people to sedition and tumult[2].

The fear of the reintroduction of popery still continued to haunt the minds of the godly brethren; and the rumour that the popish earl of Huntly had obtained an audience of his majesty was sufficient to rouse the persecuting spirit of the zealous brethren. They met in one of the churches, and after an exciting sermon, in which the king was furiously denounced, the ministers

[1] Spottiswood, p. 367.
[2] Spottiswood, b. vi. 421.—Calderwood, p. 339.—Heylin, lib. x. p. 352.

requested the nobility and gentry to remain after sermon, and to assist them with their advice and physical force. The king came that day to the Court of Session, as he often did, and being in the upper house, Robert Bruce, addressing him, said, "They were sent by the noblemen and barons convened in the Little Church, to bemoan the dangers threatened to religion by the dealings that were against the true professors." The king demanded, "What were the dangers which they saw?" "Our best affected people," said Bruce, "that tender religion, are discharged of the town: the lady Huntly, a professed papist, entertained at court, and it is suspected her husband is not far off." The king made no reply to this speech, but demanded, "who they were that dare to assemble against his proclamation." The furious lord Lindsay, "in passion" replied, "that they dare do more than so, and that they would not suffer religion to be overthrown." Lord Lindsay's insolent language and menacing gestures, with the violent rush of people into the apartment, justly alarmed the king for his personal safety; and with some difficulty he made his retreat into the hall, where the judges sat, commanding the door to be made fast. The ministers asked what course they should now pursue? "No course," cried the brutal Lindsay, "but one; let us remain, and promise to take one part; advertise our friends and the favourers of religion to come unto us; for it shall be either theirs or ours." This speech increased the sedition; some cried, To arms! others, "Bring out Haman!" meaning the king; others, "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon." The furious uproar of the people was increased by the minister of Cramond reading and commenting on the story of Haman, and his ignominious end; and violence would undoubtedly have ensued, had not the provost brought the armed crafts of the city, and dispersed the riot.

It is certain that this disgraceful riot was produced by the ministers, and Heron, a presbyterian writer, expressly acknowledges it:—"The *clergy* of Edinburgh," says he, "and the commission of the General Assembly, exerted themselves with the most persevering and outrageous activity to stir up such a general indignation throughout the city and kingdom, as should force the king to pardon Black, and submit himself to their censorial control. A tumult, by which James's life was seriously endangered, was, amid these bold exertions of the *clergy*, suddenly raised among the populace of Edinburgh[1]." Balfour also makes the same acknowledgment; "A great

[1] Heron's Hist. of Scotland, iv p. 560.

tumult was raised in Edinburgh by *the factious ministers and commons*, against the Octavians;" eight gentlemen whom the king had appointed to collect his revenue and govern the exchequer. "Some poor courtiers for effecting their own ends stirred up *the ministers*, whom they had informed that the Octavians had counselled the king to countenance the popish lords, and such as were Romishly disposed; then, without more ado, was the Blue Blanket advanced, and a factious citizen, named Edward Johnston, becomes leader to the rabble multitude, and cries "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon" against the courtiers, enemies to his truth[1]." The day after this dangerous riot, in which James was in most imminent danger of his life, strong measures were executed against the city; the king, with his whole court, retired to Linlithgow, and the courts of justice were ordered to be removed to Perth. On leaving Edinburgh, the king issued a proclamation, "that he considered the late treasonable uproar, moved by certain factious persons in the ministry (who, after having uttered most seditious speeches in pulpit, did convene a number of noblemen, barons, and others in the Little Church, and sent some of their number to his majesty, being then in the upper house of Session, using him in a most irreverent manner, with speeches ill becoming any subject. And that a multitude of the townsmen, by persuasion of the said ministers, had treasonably put themselves in arms, intending to bereave his majesty and his council of their lives), did think the said town an unfit place for the administration of justice; and therefore ordained the lords of session, sheriffs, commissioners, and justices, with their several members and deputies, to remove themselves forth of the town of Edinburgh, and to be in readiness to repair unto such places as should be appointed," &c.

These vigorous measures quickly opened the eyes of the magistrates and citizens of Edinburgh to the perilous position in which the malignant spirit of their ministers had placed them, and they strove to propitiate the king's wrath, and to avoid the penalties of high treason. The intercession of Elizabeth, the surrender of their privileges, and the payment of a heavy fine, procured forgiveness for threatening the king's life. The brethren, however, were not so easily conquered. They continued their seditious and mischievous railing both in and out of pulpit against the king and the privy council. They wrote a letter to the lord Hamilton, proposing to him to become the leader of a general rebellion, and offered to raise the

[1] Balfour's Annals, i. 400.

whole commons of the kingdom in arms, if he would take the command; but which that nobleman indignantly refused, and laid their treasonable letter before the king. Disappointed in their diabolical intention of wrapping the whole kingdom in blood and slaughter, and setting up a clerical republic, the leading ministers were obliged to seek shelter in England, where they imported and sowed their republican doctrines, which produced a bloody harvest in the following reign[1]. The same presbyterian author says, that "the *restoration* of episcopacy was soon after recurred to, as an additional measure requisite to check the turbulence of the presbyterians[2]."

The above-mentioned letter was written by Robert Bruce, and signed by him and Balcanquhal; in which, after narrating the injuries sustained by the church, they say, "that the people, animated by the *word* and *motion of God's Spirit*, had gone to arms." The *word* unquestionably meant their own inflammatory sermons, which they called the word of God, and ascribed that crime to the motion of the Holy Spirit, which He has, by the mouth of his apostle, pronounced a mortal sin. It was truly a spirit at enmity with God, and ought to have been transferred to a herd of swine. "And that the godly barons and other gentlemen that were in town had convened themselves and taken on them the patrociuie of the church and her cause; only they lacked a head and special noblemen to countenance the matter; and since with one consent they had chosen his lordship, their desire was that he should come to Edinburgh with all convenient diligence, and utter his affection to the *good cause*, accepting the honour which was offered unto him." The brethren appointed one of their usual fasts, and at the same time deliberated whether they should excommunicate the lord president and the king' advocate. Welsh, a preacher, volunteered his services, and in his sermon he railed most unmercifully against the king and his whole court; saying, "he was possessed with a devil, and one devil being put out, seven worse were entered in place; also, that the subjects might lawfully rise and take the sword out of his hand."

1597.—This ungodly broil of the brethren, instead of wresting the sword from the king, as it was their intention to do, served materially to strengthen the hands of government. After this clerical tempest and solution, the king recovered a great deal of that authority which had been wrenched from him by the brethren, whose licentious liberty was now become dangerous to the government, and even an intolerable nuisance to

[1] Calderwood.—Spottiswood.—Balfour's Annals. [2] Heron.

the more rational and sober members of their own body. The magistrates of Edinburgh surrendered to the king the privilege of the citizens to elect their own ministers; and the petulant, factious opposition of the ministers became henceforward less perplexing and embarrassing to government. Parliament, when it met, declared the late riot and correspondence of the brethren *high treason*, which subjected them to the pains and penalties for that crime, although, from James's clemency, they never were inflicted.

The king, being sincerely desirous of establishing such a decent order in the kirk, as might correspond with the word of God, and the usage of the primitive church, took advantage of this juncture to summon a General Assembly, and to propose some measures for effecting this purpose. Presbyterian writers endeavour to show that this Assembly was not legal, and consequently that its acts are null and of no effect: but all princes have called together assemblies of their national churches; and, besides, James had compelled them to submit to his appointment of their assemblies, and to his presiding in them by his commissioner. But "the marches" of the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions had never been properly defined. The brethren assumed a power to dictate to the civil government, and to carry a censorial inquisition into the bosom of every family in the kingdom; they denounced both temporal and eternal vengeance against all impugners of their inquisitorial censorship. The king, therefore, to adjust this most troublesome question, called this Assembly together at Perth, on the 28th February, expressly "for treating and determining the bounds and exercise of the spiritual jurisdiction;" and, that the members might be duly informed, he printed and published a list of fifty questions, with a preface, wherein "he took God, the searcher of all hearts, to record, that his intention was not to trouble the peace of the church with thorny questions, nor yet to claim to himself any unlawful and tyrannical government over the same, but only to have the policy of the church so cleared, as, that all corruptions being removed, a pleasant harmony might be established betwixt him and the ministry[1]."

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 131-8.—The articles were in number fifty-five, and they were drawn up in the form of questions:—1. May not the matters of the external gubernation of the church be disputed *sine fide et religione?* 2. Is it the king severally, or the pastors severally, or both conjunctly, that are to establish the acts concerning the gubernation of the church; or what is the form in their conjunction in making the laws? 3. Is not the consent of the most part of the flock, and also of the patron, necessary in the election of pastors? 4. Is it lawful

These searching questions puzzled and perplexed the Presbyterian ministers; for they laid bare the nakedness, informality, and the abuses of their whole discipline. They took great

for the pastor to leave his flock against their wills, albeit he have the consent of the presbytery; and for what cause should the presbytery consent thereto? 5. Is it lawful for a minister to use such application than that which may edify his own flock; or is the *whole world* the flock of *every* particular pastor? 6. Is he a lawful minister who wants *impositionem manuum?* 7. Is it lawful to pastors to express in particular the names of councillors, magistrates, or others whatsoever, in pulpit, or so lively to describe them that the people may understand whom they mean, without notorious declared vices and private admonitions preceding? 8. For what vices should admonitions and reproving of magistrates pass publicly from pulpits, in their absence or presence, respectively? 9. Is the application of doctrine in pulpits lawful which is founded upon informations, bruits, and rumours, suspicions and conditions, if this be or that be, probabilities, likelikeliness or unlikeliness of things to come, in civil matters, which all may be false, and consequently the doctrine following thereupon? or should all applications be grounded upon the *verity* of known and notorious vices? 10. Is the text whic his read in pulpit the ground whereupon all the doctrine should be built, or may all things be spoken upon all texts, so that the reading thereof is but a ceremony? 11. May a simple pastor exercise any jurisdiction without consent of the most part of his particular session? 12. Is his session judge to his doctrine? 13. Should not the moderator of the session be chosen yearly, or any who hath voice therein? 14. May the session be elected lawfully by ministers only without the consent of the whole congregation? 15. Why should not elders and deacons of particular sessions be elected *ad vitam?* 16. How many presbyteries are meet to be in the whole country, in what places, and how many pastors of churches in every presbytery? 17. Should not the elders and deacons of every particular session have voice in presbyteries, or the pastors only? 18. What are the matters belonging to the jurisdiction of the presbytery, which may not be entreated in particular sessions? 19. What form of process in libelling and citation, what terms and diets, and what probations, should be used before the said particular sessions and presbyteries respectively? 20. What matters should the synodal assemblies treat upon which may not be decided in presbyteries? 21. Should not all who have voice in presbyteries and in the particular sessions have voice in the synodal assemblies? 22. Should each university or college, or every master or regent within colleges, have voice in presbyteries and synods, in the towns and countries where they are; as, likewise, what form of voice should they have in General Assemblies? 23. Is it lawful to congregate the General Assembly without his majesty's license, he being *pius et christianus magistratus?* 24. Is it necessary that the General Assembly should be ordinarily convened for weighty causes concerning the whole church? 25. Have not all men of good religion and learning a voice in the General Assembly? 26. Is any particular pastor obliged to repair to the General Assembly; or is it sufficient that only commissioners come from every particular session, presbytery, or synod? 27. Who should choose the commissioners, to come from every shire to give voice in the General Assembly? 28. What is the number of those that give voices, which is necessary to the lawfulness of a General Assembly; and how many of the number should be pastors, and how many other men? 29. May any thing be enacted in the Assembly to which his majesty consents not? 30. Is it necessary that the two parts of them who have *jus suffragii* should consent to any thing decerned in ecclesiastical judgments, that matters pass not by one voice more or less? 31. Hath not every judgment, inferior to the General Assembly, a territory limited, without the which they have no power of citation or jurisdiction? 32. What is the ordinary ecclesiastical judgment for his majesty's household and council, removable with his majesty to any part of the realm? 33. Should there be libelled pre-

offence at the king for thus exposing a system which they had persuaded the people was part of the gospel. From a perusal of them it will appear, that King James has the merit of forming the Presbyterian discipline in the mould in which we see it established in Scotland at the present day; and it is evident, that Melville had not been prepared with the holy discipline that was to take the place of the Knoxian prelacy. The discipline which came from his hands was without form, and was adjusted only by degrees; yet, nevertheless, it was declared to be a part of the gospel! Fearing the ridicule and contempt of the people, the leading ministers were determined to prevent any farther exposure of their nakedness, and they held many private conferences for constructing a party favourable to their cause. In the meantime the king was equally active on his part, and sent Sir Patrick Murray, a gentleman of his bed-

cepts, containing the cause of the citation and certification of the censures, before all ecclesiastical judgments; or should they answer *super inquirendis?* 34. Have the inferior judgments power to summon any to compeir before the superior? or should men be summoned only by the authority of that judgement before which they ought to compeir? 35. Is it not necessary that private admonitions, with reasonable intervals of time, pass before all manner of citations? 36. What interval of time is necessary between every private admonition and between the first citation and the day of compeirance, and betwixt the citation and the last admonition in every one of the said judgments? 37. How many citations should infer contumacy? 38. Is simple contumacy without probation of a crime, or is any crime without contumacy, a sufficient cause of excommunication? 39. Are there not divers kinds of censures, such as *prohibitio privati convictus, interdictio a cœna*, not published to the people; and last of all, *publica traditio Satanæ?* 40. Should the presbyteries be judges of all things that import slander? and if so be, whereof are they not judges? 41. Can excommunication be used against thieves, murderers, usurers, and not payers of their debts? and if so it may be, why are not the highland and border thieves cursed, as also all the forswearing merchants and usurers among the boroughs? 42. Is there any appellation from the inferior to the superior judgment? and is not the sentence suspended during the appellation? 43. Should not all processes and acts be extracted to parties having interest? 44. Is summary excommunication lawful in any case without admonition and citation preceding? 45. Have any others but pastors voice in excommunication? 46. Hath every ecclesiastical judgment a like power to excommunicate? 47. Is it lawful to excommunicate such papists as never professed our religion? 48. A woman being excommunicated, having a faithful husband, should he thereafter abstain from her company? 49. Is it not reasonable, before any letters of horning be granted by the session upon process of excommunication, that the party should be cited to hear them granted? 50. Hath not a christian king power to annul a notorious unjust sentence of excommunication? 51. May any council or university be excommunicated? for what cause, by whom, and the manner thereof? 52. When the pastors do not their duty, or when one jurisdiction usurpeth upon another, or any schism falleth out, should not a christian king amend such orders? 53. May fasts for general causes be proclaimed without a christian king's command? 54. May any ecclesiastical judgment compel a man to swear *in suam turpitudinem?* 55. Should there any thing be entreated in the ecclesiastical judgment prejudicial to the civil or private men's rights? and may not the civil magistrates stay all such proceedings?

chamber, to canvas the ministers in the north, and to secure their votes, because as yet the northern brethren had not shewn any attachment to the presbyterian discipline[1].

On the 8th of February the synod of Fife met at St. Andrews, and appointed their members, with a long list of instructions, to protest at the Assembly for the liberties of the Church[2]. Andrew Melville organised a powerful opposition, and sent his nephew, James, to be its leader. The ministers were exceedingly offended that the holy discipline should be disputed in the Assembly, or that the gospel, as it had been taught by them, should be doubted by the people; but the king was supported by the ministers from the northern parts, and Melville's opposition proved of little consequence.

The king himself removed to Perth, and the Assembly met by the royal summons on the 28th of February. Some members had been sent up with restricted powers, and instructions not to vote for any radical changes. Suspecting that some designs inimical to his supremacy were on foot, James sent sir John Cockburn to demand whether or not they held the present to be a lawful General Assembly. This was not the universal opinion; and had not the king fixed them at this time by their own act, it would have given him much future trouble, as the ultra party would have declared its conclusions null and void. "*After long reasoning*, answer was made, that they *did esteem the meeting to be a lawful General Assembly*, called extraordinarily by his majesty's letters; and that they would hear, treat, and conclude of things that should be moved unto them according to the commissions wherewith they were authorised[3]." James Melville, in name of the synod of Fife, protested against its legality and the validity of all its acts, and then took his departure, lest, as he said, the king might have corrupted him in a private conference.

The king desired the Assembly to censure the brethren of Edinburgh, who had created the late riot in that city; to subscribe the bond acknowledging the king's supremacy in all causes of sedition, treason, and other civil and criminal matters, and in seditious speeches from the pulpits; and he required them to remove the excommunication denounced against the earl of Huntly. In reply, the ministers pleaded ignorance of the riot and the subsequent flight of the Edinburgh brethren, and that having no jurisdiction over them, they could pass neither judgment nor censure. This was a mere subterfuge,

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 437. [2] Calderwood, 879.
[3] Spottiswood, b. vi. 438.—Calderwood, 394.

for the General Assembly claims to be supreme; and in the case of the Roman Catholic peers, the synod of Fife, which was an inferior and merely a local court, assumed the powers of both censure and judgment, although these noblemen were not members of their communion, nor were resident within the bounds of that synod. For the bonds, they said they had already taken an oath to acknowledge his power and authority, and would not decline the same; but with respect to pulpit speeches, they intreated time to consider of that against next Assembly. Even the best-disposed of the ministers seem to have been very reluctant to part with this ready engine of agitation, by which, at any time, the kingdom could be blown into a rebellion. In conclusion, they professed their willingness to absolve the earl of Huntly. This is the substance of their answers, and which the king thought it prudent to accept, that he might not drive the presbyterian party to desperation, and because hopes had been held out that farther concessions would be made to the royal authority.

The king gained a number of the more moderate ministers, who, says Spottiswood, "both then and afterwards, in all assemblies and conventions, did stick fast unto him;" and he prevailed on the Assembly to yield in many things to which, in the pride of their prosperity, they would have scorned to submit. The principal points were,—1st, That it is lawful to his majesty, by himself or his commissioners, or to the pastors, to propose in a General Assembly whatsoever point his majesty or they desired to be resolved or reformed in matters of external government, alterable according to circumstances; providing it be done in right time and place, *animo ædificandi, non tentandi*. 2d, That no minister should reprove his majesty's laws, acts, statutes, and ordinances, until such times as first he hath, by the advice of his presbytery, synod, or General Assembly, complained and sought remedy of the same from his majesty, and made report of his majesty's answer, before any further proceeding. 3d, That no name should be expressed in pulpit to his rebuke, except the fault be notorious and public; which notoriety is thus defined,—if the person be fugitive, convict by assize, excommunicate, contumax after citation and lawful admonition: nor yet should any man be described vively by any other circumstances than public vices, always damnable. 4th, That no minister should use application wherein he hath not a principal respect to the edifying of his own flock and present auditory. 5th, That every presbytery take diligent account of the pastor's doctrine, and that he keep himself within the bounds of his words. 6th, That the answers to the sixth ar-

ticle shall be superseded until the next General Assembly, suspending, in the meantime, all summary excommunication until the said Assembly. 7th, That the seventh article be remitted to the next Assembly. 8th, That all summonses contain the special cause and crime, and none to be given out *super inquirendo*. 9th, That no conventions shall be amongst the pastors without his majesty's knowledge and consent, except their sessions, presbyteries, and synods, the meetings for the visitations of churches, admission or deprivation of ministers, taking up of deadly feuds, and the like, which have not been found fault with by his majesty. 10th, That in all principal towns the ministers shall not be chosen without his majesty's consent, and the consent of the flock. 11th, That all matters concerning remanent questions shall be suspended, and neither damned nor rebuked in pulpit or other judicatories till they be decided in the General Assembly; and that no matters importing slander shall be called before them in the meantime, wherein his majesty's authority is prejudged, causes ecclesiastical only excepted.[1]

This was a great victory, and with which James was very well satisfied; he, therefore, the more readily granted, at the Assembly's intercession, remission of the parties concerned in the late riot, the cause of which he distinctly *laid upon the ministers*. He then dismissed the Assembly, and appointed another to meet at Dundee on the 10th of May next.

This year the illustrious John Lesslie, bishop of Ross, died at Brussels, where he had chiefly abode since the murder of his sovereign, queen Mary. "A man he was, though differing from us in religion, worthy to be remembered for his fidelity to the queen his mistress, and the extraordinary pains he took to procure her liberty, travelling with all the neighbour princes to interpose their credit with the queen of England for her relief. Neither was he deficient in ministering the best consolations he could furnish for bearing patiently her cross, whereof one treatise he afterwards published, full of piety and learning. How heavily he took her death it cannot well be expressed; yet, comforting himself in the best sort he could, he put off to this time; and, being much weakened by a languishing sickness that held him some months, he ended his days. The history of his country, from the beginning of the nation to these times, written by him in the Latin tongue, doth witness both his learning and judgment[2]." The following year, Mr. David Lindsay, minister of Leith, was promoted to the see of Ross. It is curious,

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 441. [2] Ibid. 442.

that the Roman bishops made no attempt to perpetuate their line of succession in Scotland, which entirely ceased on the death of archbishop Beaton, in the year 1606[1].

The Assembly of last year had appointed the following Assembly to meet at St. Andrews in April. Robert Pont, with a few of the sincerer sort, met there accordingly; but as the king had appointed the Assembly to meet at Dundee in May, very few attended, and these separated after having fenced the meeting and protested for the liberty of the kirk. This was an attempt of the presbyterian party to recover the ground which their own violence had lost. Before separating, they protested that the late Assembly was unconstitutional, and all its acts null, for eight several reasons; but in especial, "because it was convocated to demolish the established discipline, as appeared by the printed questions *calling in doubt* the whole discipline, at least to gain some advantage against it." Notwithstanding their protest and humiliation "under this desolation," "the Assembly of the new fashion" met at Dundee in May, which Calderwood denominates a *corrupt* one: and he draws a frightful comparison between the "*sincere* Assemblies and the *corrupt* ones[2]." In this Assembly, the ministers of Edinburgh, who had been so deeply engaged in the late dangerous riot, and who had been allowed to return and resume their charges, now resigned them, declining to serve any longer, unless they should have particular flocks assigned to them, and acknowledged that they were "wearied of that confused ministry." Heretofore the city ministers had lived together in one common house, which gave them an opportunity to consult in private, to foster seditions, and to put their treasons into form. The king required them to give up this domicile, and to reside in different houses separate from each other, so that they might not meet together without observation. By this arrangement he aimed at nothing more than to reduce the people to a sense of their duty, to curb the intolerable licentiousness of the city ministers, "the watch-tower of the nation," and to settle good order in the city churches. The city of Edinburgh was therefore divided into parishes, and a minister appointed to each. During the sitting of this Assembly, the king admitted Melville and his nephew to a private audience, and, says Calderwood, "the king began to speak mildly to Mr. Andrew; but when he began to touch the matters that were to be treated, Mr. Andrew broke out in *his wonted manner*, so that all that were in the house and below

[1] Keith's Catalogue, 442.
[2] Calderwood, p. 402.

and without heard them. In the end the king becometh calm, and dismisseth him favourably[1]."

The king gained another point of some importance, which was, "that an uniform order be kept in the ordination of ministers, and that none be admitted but by *imposition of hands*, and to a *certain flock* on which they shall be astricted to attend[2]." "It was at this time," says Heylin, "that Dr. Bancroft, bishop of London, began to correspond with the king, whom he recognized as Elizabeth's undoubted heir and successor. He reflected how much it would conduce to the peace and happiness of both kingdoms if they were each governed by the same form of ecclesiastical polity; and he accordingly submitted a plan to his majesty by which he might restore episcopacy to the kirk." The success which had attended his late measures greatly conduced to this end; and the restoration of the rite of imposition of hands, with the astriction of the ministers to particular churches, were two very important steps towards it. But James's most dexterous movement, and one which was likely to save him from that rude familiarity with which every individual minister had been accustomed to treat him, was the appointment by the Assembly of thirteen of their number to attend on his majesty constantly. These were called *the commissioners of the kirk*, and were to form the king's *ecclesiastical council*; they might be considered as the seminary of the future bishops, being the exact number of the bishopries. They were instructed to settle ministers in the churches of Edinburgh and in all the chief cities and towns in the kingdom; to present all petitions and grievances of the kirk to the king; and to advise with the king in all such affairs as were conducive to the peace and prosperity of the kirk[3].

By his wise and vigorous measures, James had attached such a majority of the ministers, that he found little difficulty in subduing the turbulent presbyterians, who, nevertheless, still uttered seditious passages in their sermons. He had procured the censure and punishment of Black; and also of one Wallace, who had, in a sermon, abused and insulted his principal secretary of state. In their present temper he even ventured to assault the ringleader and author of all the recent seditions and disturbances. A royal visitation was accordingly ordered of the University of St. Andrews, of which the founder of the "holy discipline" was the rector. A more dangerous man could not have been placed in a situation of all others the

[1] Calderwood, p. 403. [2] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 414.
[3] Heylin, bb. x. 355-6.

most convenient for implanting those republican principles that are so intimately blended with the presbyterian system. It was found, on inquiry, that instead of teaching divinity in his college, Melville lectured on politics: "whether the election or succession of kings were the best form of government? How far the royal power extended? And whether kings were to be censured and deposed by the estates of the kingdom in case their power should be abused?" The fruit which this seed produced was reaped in the following reign, by the rebellion of the whole presbyterian and puritan party, and the murder of the king. The king, therefore, with the advice of his ecclesiastical council, removed Andrew Melville from his office of rector, and restricted him from being a member of any presbytery, synod or assembly. The ecclesiastical commissioners also recommended that no man should for ever after continue rector above the space of one year, and which the king confirmed. The ministers of St. Andrews had, under Melville's auspices, been exceedingly turbulent, and the council of ministers next deposed and removed them, to the entire satisfaction of their parishioners, and then inducted Mr. George Gladstanes from Arbirlot in Angusshire, and others into their charges who were "accepted of the people with a great applause[1]."

On the 13th of December, parliament met, and an act was passed to restore the Roman catholic noblemen to their estates and titles[2]. The late clerical riot, in which the king was exposed to so much personal danger, was declared by parliament to be high treason. The king's ecclesiastical council, or the commissioners of the church, in its name, presented a petition, praying "that the ministers, as representing the church and third estate of the kingdom, might be admitted to give voice in parliament, according to the acts made in favour of the church, and its ancient rites and privileges." James had the welfare of his native church sincerely at heart, and he was now in the zenith of his power; for by his own abilities and address he had conquered the obstinate and intractable brethren, and compelled them to acknowledge his supremacy as civil head of the kirk. This petition met with considerable opposition, but James derived great advantage from the indefinite manner in which it was worded. He was very anxious to have it adopted, and at last obtained an act wherein it was declared, "That such pastors and ministers as his majesty

Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 417.—Heylin, lib. x. 356.—Calderwood, p. 410-11. Balfour's Annals, i. p. 402.

should please to provide to the place, title, and dignity of a bishop, abbot, or other prelate, at any time, should have voice in parliament, as freely as any other ecclesiastical prelate had at any time bypast; and that all bishopries then in his majesty's hands and undisposed of to any person, or which should happen to fall void thereafter, should be only disponed to *actual preachers* and *ministers* in the church, or to such other persons as should be found apt and qualified to use and exercise the office of a preacher or minister, and who in their provisions to the said bishopries should accept in and upon them to be actual pastors and ministers, and according thereto should practise and exercise the same[1]." This act advanced James's plans for the restoration of the titular episcopacy formerly established, and there cannot be any doubt but that he was firmly determined to restore it, being the only means of curbing the intolerable licentiousness of the "sincerer sort," the "godly brethren," or the presbyterian party. These had from the commencement of their "holy discipline" embroiled the whole kingdom in confusion by their insatiable lust of power, their censorial interference in all public and private affairs, and their unceasing attempts to establish an ecclesiastical republic on the ruins of social order.

1598.—In consequence of the late enactment, which restored the spiritual estate to its place in parliament, the king anticipated the meeting of the Assembly, which had been appointed to convene at Stirling on the first Tuesday of May. He therefore summoned an Assembly to meet at Dundee in March. Peter Blackburn, minister of Aberdeen, was chosen moderator; the king being present, he desired "to be resolved touching their acceptation of place in parliament, with the form, manner, and number of persons that should be admitted to have voice; and thereupon desired them to enter into a particular consideration of the whole points of the act; and first to reason whether it was lawful and expedient that the ministers, as representing the whole church within the realm, should have voice in parliament or not." After long debate, the Assembly concluded, "that ministers might lawfully give voice in parliament and other public meetings of the estate, and that it was expedient to have some always of that number present, to give voice in name of the church;" and they farther recommended, that the number which had that right when the Roman catholic church was the establishment, should be appointed; that is, fifty-one persons. Such a numerous prelacy excited a hope in the minis-

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 449.—Heylin, lib. x. p. 357.—Calderwood, p. 402.

ters that each might stand some chance of acquiring the privilege of a seat in parliament, and no doubt, in some measure, it influenced their minds in concurring with this measure. It was also resolved that the election of these prelates partly appertained to his majesty, and partly to the church: and as time would not permit the discussion of other points, as the mode of election, revenues, and whether or not the office should be for life, by what titles they should be designated, and what precautions should be adopted for preventing corruption, &c.: all these and some other points, therefore, were remitted to the presbyteries to be first considered, and then to be re-considered in the synods, which were appointed to meet simultaneously on the first Tuesday in June. After these meetings, three ministers from each synod, with the principals of the universities, were to meet his majesty, "with power to them being so convened to treat, reason, and confer upon the said heads and others appertaining thereto: and in case of agreement and uniformity of opinion, to conclude the whole question touching voice in parliament; otherwise, in case of discrepance, to remit the conclusion to the next General Assembly[1]."

The king had now become master of his ministers; he managed the Assemblies at his pleasure, and restrained the turbulent preachers from meddling with political or personal matters in their sermons, and he procured an act of Assembly, declaring all summary excommunications to be contrary to law. The General Assembly was restricted from meeting without the king's precept, and he acquired the patronage of the churches in all the principal burghs in the kingdom. In short, he was now *supreme head* of the church, acquired by his own address and management; and he conquered a host of the most pertinacious, pragmatical, meddling, and seditious preachers with which any country was ever afflicted. A little of the Geneva leaven was, however, exhibited in the commencement of the Assembly of 1597, and which will be most indicative of the spirit of the times and the parties, if given in Calderwood's own language. "After calling of the roll of the commissioners, Mr. Andrew Melville was challenged by the king for coming to the Assembly, seeing by his authority he was discharged from all Assemblies. He answered, he had a doctoral charge in the kirk which was ecclesiastical. But the king would suffer nothing to be done till Mr. Andrew was removed. He was commanded by the king to keep his lodging. Upon Wednesday the eighth, Mr. Patrick Galloway had a flattering sermon, and

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 409.

exhorted to a confused peace, without due distinction betwixt peace in God and peace in the Devil. The assessors were elected by the king against all order. Nothing of moment was done the first two days, but ministers sent for to the king. Upon Thursday the 9th, Mr. Andrew Melville and Mr. John Johnston, Professors of Theology in St. Andrews, were charged to depart out of the town of Dundee, under the pain of horning. When the Assembly convened, Mr. John Davidson said, there was wrong done to the Assembly in discharging Mr. Andrew Melville and Mr. John Johnston. I will not hear one word of that, said the king, twice or thrice. We must crave help, then, said Mr. John, of him that will hear us[1]."

In the new division of parishes, a new set of ministers was appointed. Robert Bruce had never been ordained in any way; he had merely a toleration, or, as he said, "an approbation of the General Assembly," for ten years, that he, as a confessed laic, had exercised the whole functions of a minister. Yet during all this time he administered the sacraments, and they were esteemed valid, even without such ordination as the holy discipline could confer. He himself alleged, that "the *approbation* of the General Assembly was equivalent to ordination;" and he made the most determined resistance to the imposition of hands, and even created a tumult in the church, by appealing to the people, when three ministers had met there for the purpose of ordaining him. And it was not till a threat of the deprivation of his benefice was held out, that he at last submitted, on the 19th of May, but not without a protest. "It is to be observed," says Calderwood, "that this imposition of hands, whereabout this business was made, was holden for a ceremony unnecessary and indifferent in our kirk, while that now they were laying the foundation of episcopacy, it was urged as necessary[2]."

Although the Melvillians had set aside Knox's Book of Discipline as being of too episcopal a complexion for their discipline, yet they retained some of its features. He did not approve of the imposition of hands in ordination or admission, as he called it; "for albeit the apostles used imposition of hands, yet, seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremony we judge *not necessary*." There is a remarkable coincidence of language in this decision with the *non obstante* of the council of Constance—"though Christ did institute in both kinds, and the primitive church did so ad-

[1] Calderwood, p. 415, 416. [2] Calderwood.

minister, yet we desire the contrary to be observed[1]." The Melvillians followed Knox in rejecting the rite of the laying on of hands, and a presbyterian minister of the present day, of some celebrity, addressing the Anglican bishops and clergy, says, "After a lapse of twenty-one years, and it is said at the *earnest entreaty of king* JAMES, and in order to *gratify* his majesty, the reformed church of Scotland consented to the form of ordination now in use, as one '*not necessary*,' as in your church it is esteemed, *but as proper and becoming*. We are therefore bound to tell you, in all honesty, that at no period of our church's history has she looked upon ordination as conveying, through an apostolical channel and chain of unbroken succession, the indelible character, graces, and influences, of which you hold it to be the divinely appointed vehicle[2]."

The general tone of moderation shewn in the synods, on the discussions of the propositions which were remitted to them from the Dundee Assembly, induced the king to hope that he should not meet with any very violent opposition to his views. He therefore issued letters to the synods, requiring the commissioners from each to meet him at Falkland, on the 29th of July. There, says Spottiswood, "after a long deliberation, it was with an unanimous consent agreed:" That for each vacant bishopric the church should nominate six persons, out of whom the king should choose one; but if his majesty should not like any of them, then the church should choose other six, one of whom must be chosen without farther refusal. 2. That the churches being sufficiently planted, and no prejudice done to schools, colleges, and universities already erected, he should be put into possession of the rest of that prelacy to which he was to be preferred. The following cautions were jealously inserted, at which the king winked for the present:—1. That the prelates should not propose any thing in council, convention, or parliament, in the name of the church, without the church's warrant; neither should they keep silence if any thing was moved prejudicial to the church, under pain of deposition. 2. They should be obliged to give an account of their proceedings to every Assembly, and obtain its ratification without any appeal, under pain of infamy and excommunication. 3. They should be content with that part of their benefice which should be appointed for their living. 4. That he should not dilapidate his benefice without consent of the

[1] Perceval's Roman Schism, p. 144-5.

[2] An Address to the Bishops and Clergy at Large, of the Church of England, p. 52, sec. 24. Anno 1839.

King and the Assembly. 5. That they should be bound to attend the congregation faithfully at which he should be appointed minister, in all the points of a pastor, and be *subject* to the trial and censure of his own presbytery or provincial assembly, as any other of the ministers that bear no commission. 6. In the administration of discipline, &c. he should neither usurp nor claim to himself any more power or jurisdiction than any of his brethren. 7. In presbyteries, synods, and assemblies, they should behave themselves in all things as one of the brethren, and be subject to their censure. 8. At admission they should swear to all these and other points. 9. If they should be deposed by the presbytery, &c. their places in parliament to be *ipso facto* void. 10. That they should be called *commissioners* of such and such a place, if so be the parliament be induced by his majesty to accept that title, otherwise the General Assembly should consider and determine the same; as also how long they should continue in office, whether *ad vitam*, except some offence make him unworthy, or for a shorter space, at the pleasure of the church [1].

It was by no means the king's intentions that these minute precautions should be allowed to stand in force, which would, in point of fact, have subjected the king and parliament to the control and supremacy of the General Assembly. He was glad to bring these zealous men to any agreement which would advance order, peace, and good government, trusting to time to remove their fears and prejudices, and that the men whom he intended to place in authority would, by their wisdom and prudence, make all their cautions needless.

At this conference, the ministers discussed the necessity of abolishing the *name* of bishop, and substituting in its place that of commissioners of the kirk; because the name of bishop was associated with the idea of corruption and tyranny in the minds of the people, owing to the incessant railing of the sincerer sort against that order, which having taken a deep root in the feelings and associations of the people, had created a prejudice which has not yet entirely ceased [2]. "Episcopacy in Scotland has always had to struggle with recollections, which, though they are connected with circumstances altogether foreign to its principles, as a system of church government, have had a powerful effect in swaying the sentiments of the people, and in thereby disqualifying them for a candid examination of the grounds on which it has recommended itself to

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 452.—There is not a word about this agreement in Calderwood.

[2] Calderwood.

the greater part of the Christian world. In England, from the earliest protestant times, the most eminent martyrs of which the church has to boast belonged to the highest order of the prelacy. The names of Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer, are dear to the memory of the pious, warm the heart of the patriot, and associate themselves with a long series of events, which will always prove interesting to the lover of civil and religious liberty. In the reign of James II. too, when the faith of the nation was menaced, and the constitution in church and state seemed about to fall a prey to the bigotry of the sovereign, the first victims of royal anger were the highest churchmen in the kingdom; and the first symptoms of popular indignation, accordingly, were manifested in behalf of the injured prelates who had set the first example of opposition. The hierarchy of the South, in short, has derived no small advantage, and derived no mean increase of strength, from the same class of occurrences, which, in Scotland, contributed greatly to weaken the influence of the higher clergy, as well as to cloud the annals of the episcopal establishment at large with the most unfavourable remembrances[1]."

On the 24th December the queen was delivered of a daughter, who was christened in the Chapel Royal, Holyrood House, on the 15th April, 1599, by David Lindsay, minister of Leith, and named Margaret. She died young. On this occasion, the lord Hamilton and the earl of Huntly were created marquisses. In June the king convened the estates at Edinburgh, when there were eight acts passed, the last of which was to restore James Beaton to his archbishopric of Glasgow, and to the full enjoyment of what remained of its temporalities[2]. Archbishop Beaton was consecrated at Rome, in the year 1552; but when he saw the wild proceedings of the reformers, he packed up the acts and records of his church, and transported them to France, along with the French troops. He deposited all the writs and muniments of his diocese in the Scots college and the Carthusian monastery at Paris; where they met the fate of all sacred property when the revolution broke out in 1792. Queen Mary appointed him her ambassador at the court of France, and king James continued him in the same capacity till his death in 1603[3].

1599.—The king had written a treatise on the art of government, addressed to his son prince Henry, which he called Basilicon Doron; some passages of which had been extracted

[1] Appendix to Keith's Cat. 183. [2] Balfour's Annals, i. 104.
[3] Keith's Catalogue of Scottish Bishops, 259, 260.

by Andrew Melville, to whom Sir James Semple, the king's amanuensis, had secretly shewn it; and there being some severe remarks in it on the holy discipline, whose merits no man could better appreciate than king James, it gave him great offence, particularly the following passage:—"That parity among ministers was inconsistent with the existence of monarchy; that without bishops the three estates in parliament could not be restored; and that the design of the presbyterian ministers was to establish a democracy." He dispersed copies of the obnoxious passages among his fiery brethren; one of whom, named Dykes, wrote a seditious libel, and presented it to the synod of Fife,—for which he was declared rebel, and outlawed for non-appearance. Melville and the sincerer sort had purposely misrepresented the nature and tendency of the book, so as to produce a considerable ferment, which determined James to publish it, to undeceive his people. It was found to contain much good sense, and many sagacious maxims of government, mixed with some pedantic expressions. The book found its way into England, and paved the course more effectually for his succession to that crown than all the elaborate treatises that had been written on the subject: and it greatly exalted his character for piety and wisdom in the estimation of his future subjects[1].

The king had now so thoroughly subdued the brethren, that he licensed a company of comedians to perform, and compelled the ministers to take off an excommunication which they had thundered out against both the players and the people for resorting to the theatre. It is generally believed that the immortal Shakspeare was in this company. The 1st of January was appointed hereafter to be the commencement of the year, and which has been followed in this work: formerly it began on the 25th March, or Lady Day.

1600.—On the 28th March, the General Assembly met at Montrose, where the king himself was present. The chief subject before the meeting was that of the titular bishops sitting in parliament, which the Assembly ratified; also the conclusions of the conference at Falkland in 1598. Then, for the continuance of those that should be chosen to sit in parliament, it was concluded, that "he who was admitted should annually render an account of his commission to the General Assembly; and laying the same down at their foot, should be therein continued, or if his majesty and the Assembly did think fit to employ another, he should give place to him that

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 456.

was appointed. That they who had voice in parliament should not have place in the General Assembly, unless they were authorised by a commission from the presbyteries, whereof they were members[1]."

All that now remained to be done was to nominate suitable persons to fill those bishopries that were vacant, which was done from among the most moderate and peaceably inclined of the brethren. The king intended to lop off many of the absurd restrictions which the scrupulosity of the sincerer sort had annexed to the parliamentary duties of the new bishops or commissaries. Aberdeen and Argyle had their own incumbents; St. Andrews and Glasgow were in the hands of the duke of Lennox; Moray was possessed by the lord Spynie; Orkney by the earl of Orkney; Dunkeld, Brechin, and Dunblane were occupied by titular bishops; but in the confusion and contempt of ordination incident to the Melvillian kirk, they were not preachers; Galloway and the Isles were so dilapidated, that it was scarcely remembered that they had ever existed. Only Ross and Caithness had some revenues left: to the former of which David Lindsay was preferred, and George Gladstanes to the latter[2]; but who, nevertheless, still continued to serve at their churches in Leith and St. Andrews. And thus, says the venerable Skinner, "a shadow of episcopacy was once more restored in Scotland, and the king appeared to be satisfied for the present, till he could get the substance properly and regularly recovered, which he seems all along to have had in his eye[3]." Thus, says the presbyterian Calderwood, "the Trojan horse, the episcopacy, was brought in covered with caviats, that the danger might not be seen, which, notwithstanding, was seen of many, and opposed unto, considering it to be better to hold thieves at the door than to have an eye upon them in the house that they steal not. And, indeed, the event declared that their fear was not without just cause, for these commissioners, voters to parliament, afterwards bishops, did violate these caviats as easily as Sampson did the cords wherewith he was bound[4]."

The death of John Dury, which happened at this time, must not be omitted, on account of his death-bed advice to his quondam friends. It will be recollected, that Melville employed him as a sort of cat's-paw to introduce the subject of a strife-breeding parity among ministers; and whose opinion,

[1] Spottiswood, 456. [2] Spottiswood.—Keith's Cat.
[3] Skinner's Ecclesiastical Hist. ii. 237.—Spottiswood, b. vi. 456.
[4] True History, p. 411.

after an experience of twenty years, is worth recording. He earnestly desired, he said, to have attended the last Assembly, that he might declare his mind on the subject which then occupied their attention. That being impossible, from his approaching dissolution, he entreated some brethren to visit him, and carry his dying advice to the Assembly, which was, "that there was a necessity of restoring the ancient government of the church, because of the unruliness of young ministers, that would not be advised by the elder sort, nor kept in order; and since both the estate of the church did require it, and that the king did labour to have the same received, he wished them to make no trouble therefore; and to insist only with the king, that the best ministers, and of greatest experience, might be preferred to places." As he desired, this message was delivered to the Assembly, the majority of whom received it with much approbation. He was a good but credulous man, and easily imposed on; and consequently was an excellent tool for the Melvillian party, through whose instigation he was exceedingly turbulent while he was minister of Edinburgh, and which occasioned his being banished to Montrose. After living there some time, he became minister of that town, where, says Spottiswood, "he lived well respected and in great quietness; making it appear that the many contests and strifes he had in former times proceeded not from his own disposition so much as from the suggestion of others. For all the time he lived there, no man did carry himself with greater modesty, nor in a more dutiful obedience, and was therefore well beloved and esteemed by the king. To the poor he was exceedingly helpful, compassionate of those that were in distress, and merciful even when he seemed most severe[1]."

Thus, after an establishment of only *eight years*, the presbyterian system was demolished, it having been found incompatible with civil government, and even an intolerable tyranny to the peaceably inclined of its own ministers. Many of the people reverted to the Church of Rome as a relief from the severity of the holy discipline, which was continually changing, and which was of a most arbitrary and oppressive nature. In the preface to the Basilicon Doron, James, than whom no man had more experience, gave the brethren the following character at parting with them. He represents them as "a people which—refusing to be called Anabaptists,—too much participated of their humours, not only agreeing with them in their general rule, the *contempt of the civil magistrate*,

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 157.

and in leaning to their own dreams, imaginations, and revelations; but particularly in accounting all men profane that agree not in their fancies; in making for any particular question of the polity of their church as much commotion as if the article of the Trinity was called in question; in making the Scriptures to be ruled by their consciences, and not their consciences by the Scriptures; in accounting every body ethnics and publicans, unworthy of enjoying the benefit of breathing, much less to participate with them in the sacraments, that denies the least jot of their grounds; and of suffering king, people, law, and all to be trodden under foot, before the least jot of their ground be impugned; in preferring such holy wars to an ungodly peace; and not only in resisting christian princes, but denying to pray for them, for, say they, prayer must come by faith, and it is not *revealed* that God will hear their prayers for such a prince. They used commonly to tell people in their sermons, that all kings and princes were naturally enemies to the liberty of the church, and could never patiently bear the yoke of Christ. Therefore he counsels the prince to take heed of such puritans, whom he calls the very pest of the church and commonwealth, whom no deserts can oblige, neither oaths nor promises bind; breathing nothing but sedition and calumnies; aspiring without measure, railing without reason, and making their own imaginations the square of their conscience."

A late historian, and who was himself a presbyterian, has left the following picture of the ministers of that period on record:—"In arrogant pretensions to supreme, unquestionable, uncontrolable, heaven-derived power, civil and ecclesiastical, the presbyterianism of Scotland in the days of James VI. did not yield one jot to the popery of Rome. The reformation might seem to give the Scottish sovereign five hundred popes to contend with, instead of one: should the monarchy have been humbled before the pope, that was but to be destroyed by the majestic eagle; when its strength was weakened by the presbyterian ministers, this was to be devoured by vermin, or to be stung to death by wasps. James's life was continually embittered, during his residence in Scotland, by the presbyterian ministers belying his purposes, obtruding on him their insolent advice, preaching sedition from their pulpits, exciting tumults in his towns, striving to entice his nobles from their allegiance, abetting whoever rose in rebellion against him, arrogating to themselves all the censorial powers which the Scriptures of the Old Testament teach us to attribute to the theocrasy of the ancient Jews, and to the inspired prophets,

who were the ministers of revelation. James struggled against these rabid and outrageous opponents with great dexterity, and with no small success. But he saw that their connexion, from the essential nature of uncorrupted presbytery, was much more with the people than with the throne. Republican in its intimate constitution, presbytery could never be made the steady and permanent supporter of a monarchical government, without undergoing a great change in form and principles. Of all the reformed churches, that of England alone was, in both its structure and its spirit, perfectly congenial to monarchy[1]."

This acknowledgment by a presbyterian writer is a corroborating proof that monarchy in the church as well as in the state is of divine institution: and whether or not his opinon was right, may be gathered from the whole history of the "holy discipline." The turbulence and agitation which had disturbed the kingdom, in a great measure ceased after the "congenial friend to monarchy" was restored, though it was only a maimed and titular episcopacy which was then set up. It may be gathered from the questions which the king proposed to the Assembly for solution, that the presbyterian government was at first merely nominal, and had not been brought into shape; nevertheless it would appear that, like Cummins, the jesuit who first introduced the use of extemporary prayers into England, every minister claimed the "whole world for his flock[2]." The question whether he was a lawful minister who wanted imposition of hands[3], first brought back the ministers to a resumption of that apostolic rite. The election of elders, and the number and extent of the presbyteries, had not been settled or placed on any proper basis, and his majesty's questions[4] laid the foundation of the improvement which has since taken place in these particulars. The parochial elders are now elected for life, or at least during their residence in a parish, and their good behaviour; and the bounds of each presbytery are ascertained and fixed. The twenty-first question led to the system which is now adopted, that each minister of a presbytery is a member of the provincial synod without any election; and the jurisdiction of every presbytery and synod is now restricted to their territorial bounds; neither of which appear to have been so at the period when the questions[5] were propounded. The king also reduced them to the apostolic injunction of administering *private* admonition to notorious offenders

[1] Heron's History of Scotland, v. 337.
[2] Quest. 5.
[3] Quest. 6.
[4] Quest. 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22.
[5] Quest. 26, 27, 29, 31.

before they were cited to appear and inculpate themselves by answering searching interogatories[1]. It would appear that the presbyteries had claimed and exercised a universal dominion[2]; for the king found it necessary to require them to shew the limits of their power, by demanding, "whereof were they *not* judges?" It had become absolutely necessary to limit their disposition to meddle and dictate in both civil and ecclesiastical affairs, in base imitation of the Jewish theocrasy, which may account for their assumed dogma that "*always*" Melville's new discipline "*was part of the gospel.*"

These interrogatories brought the presbyterian system out of that chaotic state in which its inventor first produced it. It may, therefore, very justly be called an Erastian discipline, as flowing from, or, at least, as having been put into shape, by the civil magistrate, and consequently can have no title to be called a *holy* discipline, or *a part of the gospel*, as Melville and his followers always did call it. The fiftieth question clearly shews the erastianism of the whole scheme,—"hath not a christian king power to *annul* a notoriously unjust sentence of excommunication?" The ecclesiastical and civil powers run in parallel lines, and if each run in their own course they can never interfere with each other; but here the civil power assumes the power of the keys, and becomes a judge of a purely religious question, whether or not a man deserves to be excommunicated.

[1] Quest. 35. [2] Quest. 40.

CHAPTER XI.

FROM THE RESTORATION OF TITULAR EPISCOPACY TO THE CONSECRATION OF THREE BISHOPS IN LONDON.

1600.—Discontent of the presbyterian leaders.—The Gowrie conspiracy.—The king desires public thanks to be given for his preservation—generally refused—the king's just sense of his deliverance.—Birth of a prince, baptized Charles.—Ministers of Edinburgh removed.——1601.—The pope's breves—intrigues of the Jesuits—An Assembly—they lament the tendency to atheism—a fast.—James translates the Psalms.—Birth of prince Robert.——1602.—An Assembly—Bruce's obstinacy.—Another Assembly—address to the king—his reply.—5th of August appointed a festival.——1603.—Death of Elizabeth—James proclaimed.—King's speech in the church—progress to London.—Death of archbishop Beaton.——1604.—Assembly prorogued.—A meeting at Aberdeen—discharged by the king's commissioner—refuse to disperse—committed to Blackness prison—summoned before the privy council—indicted, and found guilty.—1605.—The gunpowder plot.——1606.—The chancellor connived at the Aberdeen meeting.—Parliament—repeal of the act of annexation—some of the two contending parties summoned to London—four bishops appointed to preach before them.—King's address at opening the meeting—James Melville's reply.—Three questions proposed—the elder Melville's reply—offended at the ornaments of the chapel-royal—his epigram—considered a libel—he rails against the archbishop of Canterbury—elder Melville committed to the tower.—James's opinion of the church of England.—Assembly at Linlithgow—the king's letter—constant moderators proposed—opposition—agreed to.——1607.—Opposition in the presbyteries.—Synod of Perth—decided opposition to the permanent moderators—a new one elected—riot in the synod—opposition in the synods of Fife and Glasgow.——1608.—Assembly at Linlithgow.—Increase of popery.—Earl of Huntly excommunicated.—Deficiencies of the ministers.—Assembly's petitions to the king granted.——1609.—Parliament—lord Balmerino.—Correspondence with the pope.—Acts ratified.——1610.—An Assembly at Glasgow—articles agreed to.

1600.—After eight years of intolerable agitation, the presbyterian form of government was abolished by the king, with the full consent of an overwhelming majority of the ministers, and the applause of the people, whose opinions seem to have been changed by experience of its tyranny. Externally, affairs seemed to proceed smoothly, but the presbyterian party was neither extinct, nor even subdued, they only kept quiet till they saw a favourable opportunity for successful agitation. Their

leaders, who had for some time enjoyed an arbitrary power, did not patiently brook the restrictions and limitations which were imposed on them by the Dundee Assembly; neither did they look with complacency on the fair foundation that was now laid for the apostolical succession which James afterwards introduced. Soon after the king had restored, in some measure, tranquillity to the church, by the re-introduction of the titular episcopacy, he encountered the danger of assassination, by the treasonable attempt of the earl of Gowrie, at Perth, well known by the name of the "Gowrie Conspiracy," which, had it not been for the visible hand of an overruling Providence, would have proved fatal. The earl of Gowrie, whose father had been executed for high treason in 1581, invited the king from Falkland, to honour him with his company at dinner, at his house in Perth, on the 5th of August, under pretext of having a particular secret to communicate. Not suspecting treason from a nobleman whom he had restored to his father's forfeited honour and property, he incautiously accepted the earl's invitation, and came to Perth with a very small retinue. After dinner the king was decoyed into a remote chamber, where Alexander Ruthven, the earl's brother, upbraided him with their father's execution, and bid him prepare for instant death. Meantime the king, recovering from his surprise, had the presence of mind and bodily strength, while struggling with Ruthven, who had seized him by the throat, to reach a window, which he opened, and called for assistance. His retinue hearing the cry of treason, rushed to the rescue by the back stairs, for the principal stairs and passages were secured by the conspirators, and in the assault which ensued Gowrie and his brother were slain. The citizens flew to arms, and demanded the earl, who was their provost; but some of the magistrates having been admitted, and informed of the attempt to assassinate the king, returned and pacified the people. After quietness was restored the king returned to Falkland, and next day sent information of this shocking event to the privy council, with an order for the ministers to convene the people, and give public thanks to God for his majesty's deliverance. But this was inconsistent with the policy of the lately dominant party, who ill dissembled their recent defeat; and the Edinburgh ministers refused to return thanks for a mercy of which they pretended ignorance of the particulars. They were reminded, that all which government required of them was to return thanks for his majesty's preservation from personal danger; nevertheless, they peremptorily refused, alleging that "nothing ought to be delivered in the pulpit but

that whereof the truth was known, and all that is uttered in that place ought to be spoken in faith." The ministers were determined not to believe anything against a family which had rendered the presbyterian cause such good service in times past, and by no persuasions or menaces could they be induced to utter a public thanksgiving. Lindsay, bishop of Ross, however, performed that duty at the market-cross, and the people expressed great joy. "In the meantime cometh Mr. David Lindsay, minister at Leith, who had been at Falkland, and heard the king relate the story of the fact. He went with the lords of the council to the market-cross of Edinburgh, where he had an harangue for the purpose: and after, the people, with uncovered heads, praised God: which action being ended, there were ringing of bells, shooting of cannons, between three and four in the afternoon, and bonfires set out on the streets, and upon Arthur Seat, and other eminent places far and near on this and the other side of the water[1]." "News of this conspiracy coming to Edinburgh on the morrow, the sixth day, that the king had escaped this bloody plot, there were great expressions of joy amongst all sorts of people, by shootings of cannons, ringing of bells, and bonfires; and the chancellor, treasurer, secretary, comptroller, and collector, with a great many of the nobility, senators of the College of Justice, and privy councillors, went all of them to Edinburgh cross, and heard Mr. David Lindsay declare the business to the people in a very eloquent oration; which was no sooner finished, but all of them, on their knees, with lifted-up hands to heaven, gave God humble and hearty thanks for his majesty's health, safety, and delivery out of so great danger[2].

The refractory ministers were compelled to leave the city in forty-eight hours, and were inhibited from preaching within his majesty's dominions, under pain of death. Shortly after they all appeared at Stirling, and expressing their penitence, declared that they were thoroughly resolved of the truth of Gowrie's conspiracy, and were accordingly pardoned. The obstinate and bigotted Bruce still held out, and said "he would reverence his majesty's report of that *accident*, but could not say he was persuaded of the truth of it[3]." Bruce was therefore banished the kingdom, and went to France. Yet even of those who had expressed their contrition, only one performed the conditions enjoined to them; for which unchristian conduct the next Assembly removed them to country charges, till

[1] Calderwood, p. 413. [2] Balfour's Annals, i. 406.
[3] Spottiswood.

the king, with his accustomed clemency, allowed them to return to their livings in Edinburgh, and even permitted Bruce himself to return, on promise of better behaviour. "What an unaccountable and unprecedented principle," says Mr. Skinner, "do these men's consciences appear to have been actuated by, who would neither pray for one sovereign when in apparent danger, nor thank God for delivering another out of it! And how provoking it must have been to the king to have his own royal word, and the solemn declaration of so many of his nobility, thus impudently called in question; as if nothing less than his being actually murdered would have convinced these men that there had been a design to murder him! So much, indeed, had this spirit of peculiar perverseness infected the succeeding generation of that character, that for many years the story of Gowrie's conspiracy was sneered at and ridiculed by them as an idle tale, devised by the court to ruin that nobleman, whose father and grandfather had done their cause such signal services; till, about the beginning of this (the eighteenth) century, the earl of Cromarty, then lord register, published a full and authenticated account of it from the public records, which his office afforded him the inspection of, and evinced the reality of it beyond any reasonable possibility of contradiction[1]." But the democratical doctrines of the presbyterian party had not so besotted the nation as either to dispute the story, or to despise the mercy! for it had such an effect on the minds of all honest men, that in the following parliament the estate of Gowrie was confiscated, his sons disinherited, and the name of Ruthven utterly abolished. The dead bodies of the two brothers were brought to Edinburgh, hanged and quartered, and their heads fixed on the common jail, and the 5th of August was appointed by act of parliament to be kept as a day of thanksgiving in all time coming.

On the Monday following King James came to Edinburgh, and proceeded direct to the market cross, which was covered with tapestry, on which he took his seat, and, accompanied by several of the nobility, publicly returned thanks to Almighty God for the late mercy vouchsafed to him. After which, Mr. Galloway, his own chaplain, delivered a discourse from the 124th Psalm, in which he narrated the whole particulars of the conspiracy and the king's escape, "and gave the people great satisfaction, for many doubted that there had been any conspiracy." But the impartial historian must not neglect to continue the record of James's more substantial gratitude, and

[1] Skinner's Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, ii. p. 239-40.

which shews that he had the right sense of what was due to God; for he would not offer thanksgiving unto the Lord his God of that which cost him nothing. Accordingly, the next day the king had a solemn council at the palace; and in token of his thankfulness, and to perpetuate the memory of his deliverance, he mortgaged, for the entertainment of some poor men, the rent of £1000 per annum from the rents of the abbey of Scone, and ordered an honourable reward to the three gentlemen that had been instrumental in his preservation[1].

On the 29th of November, the queen was again confined at Dumfermline, and gave birth to a son, who was so tender and delicate, that the christening was hastened, lest his death should take place. No mention is made of the name of the person who baptized this prince, who was called CHARLES; but whoever did it must have been without canonical orders; and it was somewhat ominous, that if he was baptized in infancy by a presbyterian, he fell a sacrifice to their rebellious principles, and so was in his manhood baptized by them in his own blood. So the defects of his water baptism were supplied by his bloody martyrdom; which, in the opinion of the primitive church, supplied the want of that second birth which is the concomitant of water baptism by a duly commissioned minister. On the day of his baptism the prince was created lord of Ardmanoch, earl of Ross, marquis of Ormond, and duke of Albany; and soon after his majesty made a great feast to his nobility and the lords of his privy council. In honour of this auspicious occasion he created the lord Livingstone earl of Linlithgow, the lord Seton earl of Winton, and the lord Cessford earl of Roxburgh; and a number of gentlemen were knighted[2].

From the ungovernable turbulence of the ministers of Edinburgh, called by the rest "the watch-tower of the nation," the king was desirous of having them removed to other charges, and men of a more christian spirit settled in their places. The commissioners of the General Assembly were equally determined on their removal, for they had become a nuisance to all the well-disposed part of the ministers. The matter was referred to the next General Assembly, that the churches might not be left without preachers. "From that time," says Calderwood, "the banner of truth was never so bravely displayed in the pulpits of Edinburgh as before,"—or, rather, sedition was never so publicly preached[3].

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 460.—Balfour's Annals, i. 407.
[2] Balfour's Annals, i. 409. [3] Calderwood, 446.

1601.—This year Pope Clement VIII. sent his breves into England, commanding all those attached to the Roman church, under pain of damnation, to prevent the succession after the queen's death, of any one, how near soever in blood, to the throne, unless he should bind himself by oath to promote the Roman Catholic religion to his power. These breves were brought by John Hamilton and Edmund Hay, two intriguing Jesuits, and who afterwards resorted to Scotland. As soon as James heard of them, he proclaimed them, and inhibited all men from harbouring them, or assisting them, under pain of treason, declaring he would judge of their associates as of those who had treasonably pursued his own life. They found shelter, however, among the papists in the north for some years, when Hamilton was apprehended and committed to the Tower of London, where he died. He was known to have been a chief instigator of the seditions which distracted Paris during the League[1].

On the 12th of May the General Assembly met at Burntisland: John Hall, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, was chosen moderator. In the opening speech "he regretted the general defection from the purity and practice of true religion, which was so great that *it must at last terminate either in popery or atheism*, except a substantial remedy were in time provided. And because the ill could not be well cured, unless the causes and occasions thereof should be ript up, he exhorteth those that were assembled to consider seriously both of the causes of the defection and the remedies that were fitted to be applied." And is this the end at which the "holy discipline," "the morning star," had arrived?—popery or atheism!—a melancholy reflection, which speaks, trumpet-tongued, against the danger of breaking loose from lawful authority. At all periods of its existence in Scotland the pious of its communion have lamented this tendency to atheism. At the best of times there is a spirit of agitation and turbulence associated with it; and that spirit of resignation and obedience enjoined by the apostles is strangely and unnaturally wanting. There is something stern and gloomy, and terrific to the mind of the sober christian, in the "horrible decree," the maddening sense of irredeemable predestination. The presbyterian "system abounds in fearful terrors of bad angels; every emblem of mortality which the charnel-house can supply marks their sepulchres. Filial confidence, christian hope, the happy Sunday, the glad sense of resurrection, infuse no cheering spirit into

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 463.

their religion. It walks through the valley of the shadow of death, but not as fearing no evil from CHRIST's presence; for the unearthly light which breaks into it reveals not blessed angels, but shapes of dismay."

The Assembly ordained, that the Edinburgh ministers should be removed from their charges, because after the king had pardoned their contumacy in the affair of the Gowrie conspiracy, they had obstinately refused to fulfil the conditions; and the Assembly directed that they should be sent to such parts of the country as the commissioners (as the new titular bishops were called) should appoint. John Hall was excepted, as he had fulfilled his conditions and was peaceably disposed, or, as Calderwood says, he was "inclined to episcopacy." A solemn fast, on the last two *Sundays* of June, was ordered for the sins of the land, of which they give a fearful detail; atheism seems, indeed, to have made rapid strides, and many were falling back to the church of Rome, from disgust at the intolerable tyranny of the godly brethren. After long debate it was recorded that "the wrath of God was kindled against the land for the irreverent estimation of the Gospel and the sins in all estates, to the dishonour of their profession; lack of care in the ministry to discover apostates; *too hasty admission of men into the ministry;* ministers framing themselves to the humours of the people; the desolations of the churches of Edinburgh; the advancing of men to places of trust that were ill affected to religion; the education of his majesty's children in the company of papists; the training up of noblemen's children under suspected pedagogues; the decay of schools; and the not urging the reconciled lords to perform their conditions[1]."

The king proposed to this Assembly that a correct version of the Bible should be undertaken; but, although it was heartily agreed to, it never took effect. That honour was reserved for his piety as king of England: nevertheless, he himself translated the Psalms, and set them to very good metre, which are still extant[1], and a copy of which is in the possession of the writer of this history. Though affairs were going on smoothly towards the restoration of order, yet the presbyterian party were remarkably active, and kept up an underhand and secret influence. James Melville addressed a very inflammatory letter to this Assembly, but which the king would not suffer to be read. John Davidson, also, another malcontent presbyterian,

[1] Spottiswood.—Calderwood.

attempted, by letter[1], to rouse up the spirit of the holy discipline against the titular episcopacy then forming. His letter spoke the sentiments of the whole party in general, who were ready to take advantage of any conjuncture which might occur to restore their dominion over the consciences of the people. Davidson was afterwards challenged by the council for his letter, and committed to the castle: but, being in an infirm state of health, he was confined to his own house under pain of rebellion. This restriction did not continue above a month, when he was allowed to exercise his ministry as heretofore within the bounds of his parish[2].

On the 18th of February the queen was again delivered of a son at Dunfermline, who was baptized on the 2d of May by the name of Robert. He departed this life the 27th of May at Dunfermline, and was interred in the abbey[3].

1602.—James was now completely master of the brethren, and appointed the meetings of Assemblies by proclamation when and where he pleased. The Assembly of 1602, therefore, met in the chapel-royal, Holyrood-house, and they were chiefly occupied with the lamentations of the brethren over the right-hand defections and left-hand backslidings of the "sincerest kirk in the world." So great was the contempt entertained by the sincerer sort, or presbyterians, for the initiatory sacrament of baptism, that they would allow a child to die without baptism rather than administer it at any other time than during preaching. James, however, managed them so dexterously,

[1] Calderwood, p. 449.—Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 464.—Heylin, lib. x. p. 359.—"How long shall we fear or favour flesh and blood, and follow the counsel and command thereof? Should our meetings be in the name of man? Are we not yet to take up ourselves and to acknowledge our former errors and feebleness in the work of the Lord? . . . . . Is it time for us now, when so many of our worthy brethren are thrust out of their callings without all order of just proceeding, and jesuits, atheists, and papists, are suffered, countenanced, and advanced to great rooms in the realm, for bringing in of idolatry and captivity more than Babylonical, with an high hand, and that in our chief city.—I say, is it time for us of the ministry to be inveigled and blindfolded with pretence of preferment of some small number of our brethren to have voice in parliament, and have titles of prelacy? Shall we, with Samson, sleep on Delilah's knees, till she say 'The Philistines be upon thee, Samson?'" Then, after some ill-natured satire on the king's recent achievements, he adds, "Therefore, if there be any zeal in us, laying aside all bygones, let us join together as one man, and that before all things, to purge the land of this fearful idolatrie, leaving all other things to be handled in the next Assembly; taking example of the children of Israel, who, hearing but a report of the erection of a contrary altar by their brethren of Reuben, &c. determined with all speed *to have rooted them out*, if the matter had been so. The matter with us is out of doubt, and therefore let us shew our zeal for the Lord and his cause; otherwise we can look for no blessing at the hands of God."

[2] Calderwood, p. 457.

[3] Balfour's Annals, i.

that he procured the brethren to concur in an act of Assembly, "that ministers should not refuse the sacrament of baptism to infants, nor delay the same on whatsoever pretext, the same being required by the parents, or others in their name." This rational act brought them a step nearer to the church of England, from which they had so far retrograded during the reign of presbytery. But no persuasions could prevail on the bigoted Robert Bruce to comply with the condition of the sentence absolving him from his contumacy in the Gowrie business, which was to declare that the king had escaped from a *real* danger. He would only, he said, speak when and where *God should move him;* and being immoveable in his obstinacy, he was deprived of his living.

The Assembly, which should have met at St. Andrews 1. July, was prorogued by the king till the 10th of November, when it met at Holyrood House, and Patrick Galloway was chosen moderator, who addressed the king as follows:—"That the church was impugned by two sorts of enemies; to wit, papists and sacrilegious persons; and therefore, in the name of the whole church, he entreated his majesty that, as he had with great travel and happy success made the principals of the popish profession conform themselves in outward obedience, so he would use his princely authority towards the other sort, and compel them, if not to restore all, at least to grant a competent allowance to ministers forth of the tithes they possessed." The king graciously accepted this speech, and replied, "That it could not be well with the church so long as ministers were drawn from their charges to attend the yearly modification of stipends, and that he held it fittest at once to condescend upon a competent provision for every church, and deal with those that possessed the tithes to bestow a part thereof to the aforesaid uses; and, seeing that business would require a longer time than they could well continue together, that they should do well to make some overtures to those that had the commission for stipends, promising for himself that he should stand for the church, and be an advocate for the ministers." Some beneficial overtures were proposed; but they were postponed to a subsequent Assembly. It was, however, enacted that, in perpetual remembrance of his majesty's happy delivery from the late treasonable plot for his assassination, the 5th of August should be solemnly kept as a day of thanksgiving, as it had been ordained by parliament. It was also ordained that marriages should be solemnized on any day of the week that the parties interested should desire. The Assembly was then dissolved,

and appointed to meet again at Aberdeen on the last Tuesday of July 1604[1].

Calderwood asserts that SPOTTISWOOD, the historian, and afterwards archbishop of St. Andrews, who had gone to France as chaplain to the Duke of Lennox, was denounced at this Assembly for having been present during the celebration of mass; but the charge being unsupported by evidence, it fell to the ground. He also complains that this was not a free Assembly; for if any of the presbyterian ministers, who were soured and disappointed with the loss of their own influence, and the depression of their party, made any of their usual assaults upon the king or the Assembly, he says the king would boast (threaten) or taunt, and the moderator would imperiously command him silence. But he adds, "no wonder that matters went as they did, when Messrs. Bruce, Melville, and Davidson, men of great authority and credit in the kirk, were withholden from this Assembly." In fact, the leading presbyterians had become intolerable both to the king and to their own brethren, and therefore both the king and the ministers were obliged to concur in excluding them from a court which they always filled with violence and contention[2].

1603.—Elizabeth died on the 24th March; and the same day James was proclaimed, first at Whitehall, and afterwards at the cross in Cheapside, "with an infinite applause of all sorts of people."

The queen had gone on Sunday to the privy-chamber to attend divine service, and from that time she grew rapidly worse. She remained upon cushions on the floor for the next four days and nights, and no one could persuade her either to take any sustenance or to go to bed. At last, between force and persuasion, they got her to bed; but she still refused any remedy that was offered. On Wednesday, the 23d March, she grew speechless, and in the afternoon made signs for the privy council to be called; and by putting her hand to her head when the king of Scots was named to succeed her, they all knew that he was the man she desired should reign after her. At six o'clock she made signs for archbishop Whitgift and her chaplains to attend her, and she answered all his interrogatories by signs respecting her faith and hope. She kept him on his knees in prayer for upwards of an hour, "with earnest cries to God for her soul's health, which he uttered with that fervency of spirit as the queen to all our sight much rejoiced

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. p. 468-9.—Calderwood. Calderwood, p. 469.

thereat, and gave testimony to us all of her christian and comfortable end." She died on the 24th, at three o'clock in the morning, soon after the archbishop left her[1].

Sir Robert Carey, afterwards earl of Monmouth, was the first who brought the news of the late queen's death to Scotland; and James was on that same day proclaimed with due formality at the cross in the High Street. On Sunday, the 3d April, the king of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c. attended divine service at St. Giles' church, and afterwards harangued the people, as his frequent custom was, saying, "As God has promoved me to a greater power than I have, so I must endeavour to establish religion, and to take away corruption in both countries. Ye need not doubt but as I have a body as able as any king in Europe, whereby I am able to travel; so I shall visit you every three years at least, or oftener, as I shall have occasion, (for so I have written in my book addressed to my son, and it were a shame for me not to perform what I have written,) that I may with my own mouth take account of the execution of justice of them that are under me, and that ye yourselves may see and hear me, and, from the meanest to the greatest, have access to my person, and pour out your complaints in my bosom[2]."

On the 5th of April, his majesty departed on his progress to his new dominions, accompanied by a number of the nobility and gentry of both nations. The multitude of Scottish subjects who went with or followed after the court, imported into England all that spirit of insubordination which the holy discipline had engendered in Scotland, and which fermented in both kingdoms till its natural fruit was produced in the grand rebellion. If the tree be corrupt, so must the fruit be: for from within, out of the heart of men, proceed those evil thoughts which ripen into covetousness, blasphemy, pride, and rebellion, "and defile the man." And in the life of bishop Hacket this defilement is lamented: that "After the coming in of the Scots with king James, the seed of fanaticism [was] then laid in the scandalous neglect of the public liturgy, which all the queen's time was exceedingly frequented; the people then resorting as devoutly to prayers as they would afterwards to hear any famous preacher about the town. And his aged parents often observed to him, that religion towards God, justice and love amongst neighbours, gradually declined with the public prayer[3]."

James Beaton, the Roman Catholic archbishop of Glasgow

[1] Robert Carey, Earl of Monmouth's, Memoirs. [2] Calderwood, 172.
[3] Cited by the Bishop of Moray, in "A Friendly Address," &c. p. 51.

dying at Paris, the king appointed JOHN SPOTTISWOOD, the historian, as titular archbishop of Glasgow, and to attend the queen in her journey to England as her eleemosynary. This was the last link of the apostolic chain, which had come down without interruption from St. Paul, and the ancient British church, through St. Ninian, first bishop of the *Candida Casa*, or Galloway, in the fourth century; by whom the northern parts of Saxon England had been converted to the christian faith. This chain remained broken for only seven years, when an apostolic character was again imparted to the Scottish church by the consecration of Spottiswood in 1610.

On Monday, the 25th of July, king James and queen Anne were solemnly crowned in Westminster Abbey by John Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury[1]. James assumed the title of King of Great Britain, and most anxiously promoted an union between the two kingdoms. He endeavoured to abolish the name of "the Borders;" and removed the garrisons from Berwick and Carlisle, commanding the citizens to turn their iron gates into ploughshares. But that which he found to be of the most difficult accomplishment, was to repress the licentiousness of the sincerer sort of the brethren, who now broke out into all their former scurrilous abuse, when the restraint of his presence among them was removed.

1604.—The General Assembly, which was appointed to have met at Aberdeen in July, was prorogued to the same month of the following year, on account of the king's project for an union of the two kingdoms; but James being informed that some of the sincerer sort were making great preparations for attending that meeting, in order to annul all the acts of Assembly in favour of episcopacy, he directed the commissioners still farther to prorogue the Assembly, and not to name any time for its meeting till they were authorised by him. They accordingly intimated to the presbyteries his majesty's will; at the same time informing them, that the king intended to summon a number of the bishops, and some of the presbyterian brethren, to court, in order to hear their differences debated, and to prevent their disorderly meetings in future. Out of fifty presbyteries, forty-one obeyed the king's mandate; but the other nine sent their commissioners to hold an Assembly at Aberdeen in defiance of the royal authority. John Forbes and John Welsh, the leading men, were secretly prompted by some of the discontented nobility. Sir Alexander Straiton, the king's commissioner, discharged the meeting by proclama-

[1] Balfour's Annals, i. 155.

tion at the market-cross; nevertheless, the brethren met the next day, when the royal commissioner commanded them in the king's name to dissolve. They replied, that "they were warranted by the laws of the country, and that they could not betray the liberties of the church by giving way to such unlawful prohibitions." The commissioner showed them, "that the liberty granted for holding Assemblies could not annul his majesty's power for continuing or proroguing their meetings; for even the parliament, which is the highest court of the kingdom, is called, prorogued, and dismissed, as he judges most convenient, and you will not equal your Assemblies to the Parliament of the three estates." He objected to the paucity of their numbers, the absence of the ordinary clerk and the moderator of the former Assembly, which prevented their entering on the duties of an Assembly in a legal and orderly manner. These arguments made no impression; and they proceeded, notwithstanding, in their disorderly course, elected Forbes to be moderator, and continued their meeting to the last day of September. The commissioner denounced them as rebels; and, lest they should make a new uproar in September, the council cited the two leaders, Forbes and Welsh, to answer for their contempt; when they justified their congress, and declined submission to the council's authority. They were found guilty by a jury of high treason, and committed to Blackness Castle. The others were also cited for October, thirteen of whom acknowledged their offence, and were dismissed without farther trouble; but eight standing to their defence, were committed to different prisons. The sincerer sort had industriously propagated a report, that the king intended entirely to abolish their government and discipline, and to bring it to an exact conformity with the church of England, not only in the government, but also in the rites and ceremonies. These rumours, dispersed for the purpose of alarming and agitating the people, were contradicted by James himself, in a letter or declaration from Hampton Court.

The imprisoned brethren were again summoned before the privy council on the 24th October, when they declined the authority of the king and council, and appealed to the decision of a free General Assembly. The council would not admit of their declining its authority, and declared the Aberdeen Conventicle to have been unlawful, and its members punishable; but as they had now, by declining their authority, added treason to their former fault, the council deferred judgment till the king's pleasure should be known. The king directed the council to proceed against them according to law; and

they were consequently indicted on the statute of 1581, which confirmed the king's supremacy. The brethren objected to that act, as they said it was virtually annulled by the subsequent act of 1592. They were, however, found guilty, and remanded till his majesty's pleasure was known. In the meantime a proclamation was issued, "discharging all subjects, of what rank, place, calling, function, or condition soever, either in public or private, to call in question his majesty's authority royal, or the lawfulness of the proceedings against the said ministers[1]."

1605.—On the 5th November, this year, was discovered, as if by the finger of God, one of the most wicked and comprehensively destructive plots for the destruction of the king and the three estates of England, ever perhaps conceived by the wôrst of men. James had hitherto lived in a state-militant with the principles and practices of the disciples of Geneva; but he had now new, more powerful, and more atrociously wicked enemies on his hands. The whole power of Rome and its most unscrupulously wicked agents, the jesuits, were arrayed against him; a set of men who could commit any amount and every species of sin that would in any way advance the interest and dominion of the Roman pontiff. It is an established maxim in that corrupt church, that it is lawful to do evil that good may come; although an apostle has pronounced a *curse* against this principle. Clement VIII. issued a bull which denounced James as an heretic, and excluded him from succeeding to Elizabeth unless he agreed to convert his subjects, and hold his crown from the pope. This bull produced many tumults and seditions in Ireland, when king James was proclaimed there, and the Romish priests instigated the people to assault and maltreat the protestants. They took forcible possession of the churches and set up the mass, and when called to account, they justified themselves by appealing to the pope's bull, and alleged "that no person could be a lawful king who was not placed on the throne *by the pope*, and had not sworn to maintain the Romish religion." It was first proposed to assassinate the king, but Catesby proposed to destroy all their enemies "at one fell swoop," the king and royal family, the heads of the church, the peers, and the commons of England, at one blow! The chiefs of the jesuits in England approved of this wholesale butchery, which exceeded in atrocity even the Bartholomew massacre in France, "assuring them they might go on with a good conscience and perform the deed,

[1] Calderwood—Spottiswood—Balfour's Annals, ii. 2.

seeing they were *heretics*, and persons *ipso jure* excommunicated, and against whom they were set." This conspiracy was so well contrived, and the secresy of the conspirators so well secured by the administration of an oath and the sacrament, that its discovery was beyond the reach of man's ingenuity. And we may well say with the Psalmist, "If the Lord himself had not been on our side when men rose up against us, they had swallowed us up quick. But praised be the Lord, who did not give us over for a prey unto their teeth. Our soul escaped even as a bird out of the snare of the fowler; the snare was broken, and we were delivered. Therefore our help standeth in the name of the Lord, who hath made heaven and earth[1]." The papists, however, ascribed the honour of the happy discovery of the GUNPOWDER PLOT to the devil, who, they said, envying the success of so good a work, had discovered it. The demons who were engaged in this atrocious plot all confessed their guilt, and were executed for the treason, but their chiefs were canonized at Rome, and are now in the number of those *saints* whom the Trent creed says "*are to be worshipped and prayed to.*" This atrocious deed, therefore, which, instead of being the envy of the devil, ought to have been considered his master-piece and worthy of his highest love, is by this canonization and worship, made the act of the whole Church of Rome, having been beforehand authorised by the pope's authority, and afterwards confirmed by his admitting the guilty perpetrators amongst those inferior deities, whom they worship[2]. Well and truly is popery named in Scripture the MYSTERY OF INIQUITY. A despatch was immediately sent to the Scottish privy council, and a command given for a public thanksgiving in all the churches for his majesty's and the three estates of England's happy and providential deliverance from popish tyranny and bloodshed.

1606.—The brethren imprisoned at Blackness accused the lord chancellor, the earl of Dunfermline, of advising, or at least of conniving at, their illegal meeting at Aberdeen; and the king, suspecting him of double-dealing, sent sir William Irvine, his confidential servant, to ascertain the truth. The lord chancellor excused himself on the score of forgetfulness; yet the brethren substantiated their allegation of the chancellor's connivance and underhand support of their meeting at Aberdeen, and his own enmity to the order of bishops. When sir William made his report, the king sagaciously observed, "that none of the two deserved credit, for the ministers would

[1] Psalm 124. [2] Trent Creed, arts. 20, 21.

betray religion rather than submit themselves to government, and the chancellor would betray the king for the malice he carried to the bishops[1]."

Owing to a dispute about precedence between the chancellor and the king's commissioner, the earl of Dunbar, the parliament was prorogued, and removed from Edinburgh to Perth. A number of the ministers assembled there, using their best endeavours to create disunion and agitation. The earl of Dunbar sent for them, and expostulated with them, saying, "that it seemed strange to him that they who had so often petitioned for the repeal of the act of annexation, should go about to hinder it now, when the king intended to do it in part, and especially as there was nothing to be moved in prejudice of their discipline;" at the same time he reminded them, that the lives of several of their brethren were at that very time at his majesty's mercy. By his prudence he quieted these jealous agitators, and the parliament finished without any disturbance. This parliament repealed the act of annexation, and the temporalities and revenues were restored to the bishops; so far at least as was in the power of the crown. Before this, the restored bishops had been unable from poverty to attend their duty in parliament, or even to visit their dioceses. Another act was passed, more correctly defining and confirming the royal prerogative, which was rendered necessary by the seditious meeting at Aberdeen[2].

Soon after the dissolution of parliament, the king summoned a number of the presbyterian party, with the archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow, and the titular bishops of Orkney and Galloway, to assist at a conference for settling the peace of the church, to be held in his own presence at Hampton Court, on the 20th of September. The king appointed Drs. Barlow, Buckeredge, Andrews, and King, to preach before the Scottish divines on the subjects chiefly in controversy between the episcopal and the presbyterian divines. But all their arguments were thrown away on Melville and the brethren on his side. It is not to be supposed, that men prepossessed in favour of, and called there to defend, a system of government, of which Melville himself was the author, were to yield to the reasonings of men whom they despised and hated as "dishonouring Christ," and as "ruining so many souls by bearing down the purity of the gospel, and maintaining popish superstition and corruption." The attempt was absurd and impolitic, and the result that which might have been expected.

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. 496. [2] Ibid. 496.

Dr. Barlow, bishop of Lincoln, adduced proofs from Scripture and the fathers for "the superiority of bishops to presbyters, and also to shew the inconveniences of parity in the church." Dr. Buckeridge, bishop of Rochester, gave a satisfactory account of the king's supremacy in causes ecclesiastical, and in the course of his sermon frequently compared the pope and presbytery together in their opposition to sovereign princes. Dr. Andrews, bishop of Chichester, contended for the power of all sovereign princes to convoke synods and councils; and Dr. King, bishop of London, "discoursed of the office of presbyters, and did prove lay elders to have no place nor office in the church, and that the late device was without all warrant of precept or example, either in Scripture or antiquity [1]."

The first audience was on the 22d September, at which there were several of the Scottish nobility present, and Dr. Montague, dean of the chapel royal, when the king, addressing the prelates and ministers, said, "that, having left the church of Scotland in peace at his parting forth of it, he did now hear of great disturbances in the same; whereof he desired to understand the true cause, and to have their advice how the same might be best removed. This being the errand in general for which I have called you, I should be glad to hear your opinions touching that meeting in Aberdeen, where a handful of ministers, in contempt of my authority, and against the discharge given them, did assemble: and though they were neither a sufficient number, nor the accustomed order kept, they would take upon them to call it a General Assembly, and have since proudly maintained it, by declining my council, and such other means as they chose to use. The rather I would hear your minds, because I am informed that divers ministers do justify that meeting, and in their public preachings commend these as persons distressed, which is in effect to proclaim me a tyrant and persecutor."

James Melville answered, in the name of the others, "that there was no such discharge given to those ministers who met at Aberdeen, as was alleged; many of the presbyteries never having received his majesty's letters, and those who had received them considering that there were weightier reasons for holding the Assembly than for deferring it, had resolved to send their commissioners in conformity with the original convocation. Neither moderator nor clerk were essential parts of an Assembly; and, as the moderator had absented himself purposely, and the clerk had refused to serve, the brethren had

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. 497.

lawfully created others in their places. Therefore, the brethren being warranted by the word of God and his majesty's laws to meet, and having been sent there by their several presbyteries, he could not conscientiously condemn them."

His majesty next proposed three questions, and required their answers:—"1st, If it be lawful to pray publicly for persons convicted by the lawful judge as for those in distress and affliction? 2d, Whether a christian king, by his royal authority, may convoke, prorogue, and dissolve Assemblies, for causes known to himself? And, 3d, Whether the king could cite any one, civil or ecclesiastical, before the privy council, and pass judgment for whatsoever offences committed by them, in whatsoever place within his dominions; and if the king may not take cognition of the offence, and give sentence therein? and, farther, whether or not all his subjects, being cited to answer before him and his council, are obliged to appear, and acknowledge him or them for judges of these offences?" The brethren desired time for reply; and at a second meeting, when a number of the English bishops and clergy were present, the king desired their answers respecting the conventicle at Aberdeen. The Scottish bishops unanimously condemned the conventicle as "turbulent, factious, and unlawful;" but Andrew Melville replied, "that he could not condemn the Assembly, being a private man: that he came to England upon his majesty's letter without any commission from the church of Scotland, and though he had commission *in dicta causa*, yet not hearing what they could say for themselves, he could not give his judgment. Sentence was given against them in a justice-court; how justly he did remit that to the great judge; but for himself he would say, as our Saviour said in another case, *Quis me constituit judicem?*" James Melville offered to present a petition which he had received since his arrival in London, in behalf of the imprisoned ministers, which, he said, would sufficiently explain their sentiments. The king took the petition, and while he was reading it, Andrew Melville broke out into "a great passion," and upbraided the king's advocate with many foul and opprobrious epithets. The earl of Northampton inquired what was meant by certain words; the king replied, "he calleth him the *muckle deevil*:" and then, folding up the petition, said, "I see you are all set on maintaining the base conventicle at Aberdeen: but what answers do you give to the three questions?" It was replied that, "finding they concerned the whole church, they would not, by their private opinions, prejudge the same." "But you will not," said the king, "call the royal authority in question, and subject

it to your Assemblies!" This, they said, was far from their designs; "but if his majesty would be pleased to set down in writing what he required, they would labour to give him satisfaction[1]."

Andrew Melville took offence at the decent ornaments of the chapel-royal. Particularly, having attended divine service on Michaelmas-day the 29th September, he stigmatized the rites and ceremonies in a Latin epigram, "as the superstitious relics of the scarlet whore." Some busy-body showed a copy of the verses to the king, at which he was justly offended. Melville was summoned before the English privy council; acknowledged the verses, and his contempt and abhorrence of the solemn service of the church: but at the same time alleged, that he had no intention of circulating the obnoxious libel. "The archbishop of Canterbury considered it as a libel on the worship of the church of England; but as Melville was not a voluntary spectator, nor a subject of England, it cannot be deemed even a legal misdemeanor, much less within the laws of treason[2]." "Melville was moved," says Calderwood, "to see such vanity and superstition in a christian church, under a christian king, born and brought up in the pure light of the gospel, and especially before idolaters, to confirm them in their idolatry, and to grieve the hearts of true professors. When Bancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, began to speak, he charged him with profanation of the Sabbath, imprisoning, silencing, and bearing down of faithful preachers, holding up of an antichristian hierarchy and popish ceremonies. Shaking the white sleeves of his rochet, he called them Romish rags; and told him, that if he was the author of the book called 'English-Scotizing,' he esteemed him the capital enemy of all reformed kirks in Europe, and would profess himself an enemy to him in all such proceedings, to the effusion of the last drop of his blood[3]." This insolent railing was a talent with which the father of presbytery was amply gifted, but which is very discreditable to any one, and especially to the head and chief of the "godly brethren,"—"the sincerer sort,"—and is a decided proof, that the spirit with which they were actuated was in opposition to christianity, and not of a "godly" sort.

This conference produced the reverse of a good effect, and exasperated the king's antipathy to a man who had systematically taught and practised resistance, and even open rebellion, as a fundamental principle of religion. Melville was found

[1] Calderwood, p. 337-343.—Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 497, 498.
[2] Scottish Episc. Magazine, i. 66. [3] Calderwood, 548.

guilty of *scandalum magnatum*, and committed to the custody of Dr. Overall, dean of St. Paul's: the other ministers, his adherents, were committed to the charge of some of the bishops. James Melville very justly complains of this treatment, for which there does not appear to have been any just cause, as they were members of an independent established church, invited by the king to a free conference, and were surely entitled to the privileges of what is called a safe conduct. Melville was again cited before the privy council of England; the earl of Salisbury urged him to yield to the primacy, and taxed him with his indecent rhyme on the public worship of the church of England. He refused, as a matter of course, to yield, and accompanied his refusal with a most intemperate vituperation of the king, the bishops, and the lords of the council present; he accused them of "dishonouring Christ, and ruining of so many souls, by bearing down the purity of the gospel, and maintaining popish superstitions and corruptions." He was confined in the tower for several years, but at last ended his days at Sedan. James Melville was confined to the town of Newcastle-on-Tyne, and the other brethren to different parts of Scotland. The titular bishops were sent home to their sees. James directed his letters to the council of Scotland, ordering the brethren, who had been imprisoned at Blackness on account of the Aberdeen conventicle, to be banished, but which was never put in force. They were sent to remote parts of the Highlands, where they propagated their tenets. These were harsh measures, and James can only be justified, by supposing that he was compelled to adopt them by the ungovernable and seditious conduct of the godly brethren, who taught railing at dignities and rebellion as fundamental principles of their religion[1].

Of the church of England king James said, "That he found that form of religion which was established under queen Elizabeth, of famous memory, by the laws of the land, to have been blessed with a most extraordinary peace, and of long continuance; which he beheld as a strong evidence of God's being very well pleased with it. That he could find no cause at all, on a full debate, for any alteration to be made in the Common Prayer Book, though that was most impugned; that the doctrines seem to be sincere, the forms and rites to have been justified out of the practice of the primitive church; and that there was nothing in the same which might not very well have been borne withal, if either the adversaries would

[1] Calderwood.—Spottiswood.—M'Crie's Life of Melville.

have made a reasonable construction of them; or that he himself had not been so nice, or rather jealous, for having all public forms in the service of God, not only to be free from all blame, but from any suspicion. And with the church of England and her Book of Common Prayer, James expressed himself so highly pleased, that he entered into a gratulation to Almighty God for bringing him into 'the promised land,' as he called it, where religion was purely professed, the government ecclesiastical approved by manifold blessings from God himself, as well in the increase of the gospel as in a glorious and happy peace; where he had the happiness to sit among grave and learned men, and not to be a king (as elsewhere he had been) without state, without honour, and without order[1]."

The king entertained a constant care for his native church, and felt an anxious desire to settle it on a solid and lasting foundation. As a preparatory step to the establishment of a true and valid episcopacy (the titular episcopal establishment, being like the presbyterian brethren, totally deficient of canonical orders), and which was the grand design of his whole reign, induced him to convoke a General Assembly on the 10th December, at Linlithgow. He sent the earl of Dunbar as his commissioner, and who is falsely accused by Calderwood of having distributed 40,000 merks among the sincerer sort, to soften their clamours and to make them more tractable. On the appointed day, one hundred and thirty-six brethren, with thirty-three noblemen, barons, and others, assembled at Linlithgow, and elected James Nicolson to be their moderator. The commissioner presented his majesty's letter, to the following effect:—"That it was not unknown to them what pains he had taken whilst he lived amongst them, as well to root out popery as to settle a good and perfect order in the church; and that notwithstanding of his care bestowed that way, he had been continually vexed by the jealousies of some perverse ministers, who, traducing his best actions, gave out among the people that all he went about was to thrall the liberty of the gospel. Neither content thus to have wronged him, they had, in his absence, factiously banded themselves against such of their brethren as had given their concurrence to the furtherance of his majesty's just intentions; on the knowledge of which, he did lately call the most calm and moderate, as he esteemed, of both sides, to his court, thinking to have pacified matters, and to have removed the divisions that had arisen in the church; but matters not succeeding as he wished, he had taken

[1] Heylin's Hist. of Presb. lib. x. 363-4.

purpose to convene them for setting down such rules as he hoped should prevent the like troubles in future, willing them to consider what was most fitting for the peace of the church, and to apply themselves to the obedience of his directions, as they did expect his favour."

It was then proposed, on the part of the crown, that his majesty, "apprehending the greatest cause of the misgovernment of the church's affairs to be, that the same are often, and almost ordinarily, committed to such as, for lack of wisdom and experience, are no way able to keep things in a good frame; for remedying this inconvenience, thinketh meet, that at present there be nominated in every presbytery one of the most grave, godly, and of greatest authority, to have the care of the presbytery where he remaineth, till the present jars and fire of dissension which is among the ministry, and daily increases, to the hindrance of the gospel, be quenched and taken away; and the noblemen professing papistry within the kingdom be either reduced to the profession of the truth, or then repressed by justice and a due exertion of the laws. And for the encouragement of the said moderators, and the enabling them to the attendance of the church affairs, his majesty is graciously pleased to allow each of them one hundred pounds Scots, or two hundred merks, according to the quality of their charge; but where the bishops are resident, his majesty will have them to moderate and preside in these meetings. As likewise, because it often falleth out that matters cannot be decided in presbyteries, by reason of the difficulties that arise, and that the custom is to remit the decision thereof to the diocesan synod, it is his majesty's advice, that the moderation of these Assemblies be committed to the bishops, who shall be burthened with the delation of papists, and solicitation of justice against those that will not be brought to obedience; in respect his majesty hath bestowed on them places and means to bear out the charges and burdens of difficulty and dangerous actions, which other ministers cannot so well sustain and undergo."

This overture naturally produced a warm debate. Considerable opposition was made to the proposal of permanent moderators, as it was not difficult to imagine that such a functionary might gradually merge into a bishop. One of the godly brethren, without pretending to have the second sight, alleged he "saw the horns of the mitre" in the back-ground. Great fears were expressed that a constant moderator would usurp an authority inconsistent with his place over his brethren; but in the end, twelve resolutions were drawn up and agreed to, all tending to check any usurpation of power,—also providing for

absence, death, or other casualties, by which the official moderator might be prevented from presiding; and, with these precautions, the king's overture was agreed to; four only of the whole Assembly dissented, four others refused to vote,—pretending to have no authority from the presbyteries which they represented, and two more answered *non liquet*. In conclusion, on a review of the rolls of the presbyteries, the existing moderators were appointed to continue as the new permanent presidents, unless their respective synods should see cause to appoint otherwise[1]. James Law, titular bishop of Orkney, was deputed to acquaint the king with the passing of this act; and also to present some petitions, urging the king to measures of vindictive persecution against the Roman Catholic lords.

1607.—When James saw the act for the perpetual moderators, he said, he was too well acquainted with the brethren to expect that this ordinance would be readily submitted to, for their "desire to keep all things in a continual constant volubility was such," he said, "that they would never agree to a settled form of government;" and the event justified his majesty's prediction. Some of the presbyteries silently acquiesced, but decided opposition was evinced by the greatest number, more especially by those synods which had been placed under the bishops as their perpetual moderators. The presbyterian party struggled hard against the new measures, and dexterously caught at every circumstance to avert their own extinction. In the synod of Fife, archbishop Gladstanes was violently opposed when he assumed the chair in accordance with the late act, and the brethren attempted to elect one of their own number as moderator; and some of them, in other dioceses, also attempted to prevent the bishops from acting as the moderators.

But the synod of Perth signalized itself in the most extraordinary manner at their meeting on the first Tuesday in April, when the sincerer sort assembled in great numbers, in order to oppose the approach to regularity introduced by the Linlithgow Assembly. In manifest contempt of the act of that Assembly, they peremptorily inhibited all the presbyteries within their jurisdiction from acknowledging its authority, or from obeying its conclusions in the matter of the permanent moderators. Not contented, however, with the resistance fundamentally inherent in their constitution, they threatened to excommunicate Mr. Lindsay, the parson of St. Madois, whom the Assembly had confirmed as the permanent moderator of

[1] Spottiswood.—Calderwood.

the Perth presbytery, if he should dare to act as president, in obedience to the authority of the supreme court.

The lord Scoon was sent to attend this synod, armed with his majesty's commission; and he threatened them with the king's vengeance if they refused to admit the constant moderators to the discharge of the duties of their office. But threats had little effect on the sincerer sort, who were case-hardened with spiritual pride and self-sufficiency. Row, the last moderator, preached, and it was the king's instructions to lord Scoon, that if he impugned the late acts of Linlithgow, he should pull him out of the pulpit; and as his sermon was chiefly directed against these acts, lord Scoon had risen several times to stop the preacher, but was prevented by some gentlemen that sat near him. The brethren met hastily again after dinner, to elude the commissioner's presence, but being advised of their stratagem, he suddenly entered, and challenged them for proceeding to business before he had produced his commission. Row answered, that they were accomplishing preliminaries, so as not to interrupt the business of the synod by electing a moderator after his lordship had taken his seat; and it was part of the official duties of the *new* moderator to receive his lordship's commission. Lord Scoon informed him, that his commission chiefly related to the moderator, and if they presumed to elect one, and refused to read his commissions, one from the king, the other from the council, he would instantly discharge the synod, and lay it under the pain of treason. After much altercation, it was agreed to adjourn till the following day. At their next meeting the same intemperate language was used on both sides; and finally the brethren proceeded to take the votes for a moderator of their own sentiments. Row took the roll, and began to read over the names of the members: lord Scoon interfered to prevent this wanton insult on the king's authority and the act of Assembly, and attempted to snatch the roll out of Row's hand. They struggled for the possession, but Row being a powerful man, pinned his lordship down with his right hand, and with his left extended, held the roll, and read it to the end. In spite of the commissioner's threats, persuasions, and entreaties, they proceeded to the election of a moderator, and in defiance of the act of Assembly and the king's authority, which appointed the bishop as the fixed president, they chose Henry Livingston, and commanded him to enter to his place.

In the midst of this uproar and bitter excitement, the brethren held up their hands in prayer to the God of order, unity, and peace. Lord Scoon attempted to prevent them; he pro-

tested against the election, and threatened them with the vengeance of the laws. He rose to prevent the moderator from taking his seat, and collaring each other, Livingston commenced his prayer, saying—"Let us begin at God, and be humbled in the name of Jesus Christ." "Lord Scoon, in a great rage, chapping on his breast, said with a loud voice, 'The devil a Jesus is here[1].'" Livingston proceeded, nothing daunted, when Scoon threw the table-cloth over him, but which did not impede his purpose; for they continued at their prayer, "and besought the Lord to be avenged on the blasphemy of his name, and contempt of his glory, which was trampled under foot by profane men." Finding that nothing else would do, his lordship called for force to eject them, and now denounced them rebels. They returned next day to their hall, but finding the door locked, and admission denied them, they collected seats and benches outside the church door, determined at all hazards to hold a synod even in the open air; whence they hurled the thunders of excommunication and anathemas against the lord Scoon, all presbyteries which should admit of the constant moderators, and every individual who should accept of the office. The members were cited to answer for their seditious conduct before the privy council, were discharged from meeting again, and the presbyteries within its jurisdiction were commanded to accept their appointed moderators, under pain of rebellion[2].

In Fife the resistance to the act of Assembly was equally determined: the king's commissioners could, by no threats or entreaties, induce the synod to accept of the archbishop of St. Andrews as their moderator, agreeable to the injunctions of the General Assembly. They were accordingly dissolved, and prohibited from again meeting, and all the burghs were discharged from receiving them. The synod of Glasgow was held on the 18th of August, at which the earl of Abercorn acted as his majesty's commissioner. The same difficulties with the brethren were experienced in that synod also; but by threats of proclaiming them rebels, he succeeded in procuring the election of archbishop Spottiswood to be their moderator, and so to conform to the act of Assembly[3]. In short, the opposition was strong in those synods, where the sincerer sort were most numerous; but the king was resolute to restore order; and had affairs been conducted with more prudence and less acri-

[1] Calderwood, 557. [2] Ibid. pp. 565-567.
[3] Balfour's Annals, ii. 22.

mony on the part of his agents, it was much to have been desired. But he would have shown more political wisdom if he had introduced, gradually and silently, those changes which tended to the subversion of that "parity among ministers," which, we have seen, produced a most abundant harvest of "strifes." Row and Livingston were summoned to appear before the privy council, to answer for their proceedings at the synod of Perth. Row absconded, and lay concealed for some time among his political friends; but Livingston was severely reprimanded, and strictly enjoined to confine himself within the boundaries of his own parish. The titular bishops, or commissioners, as they were called, met together at Holyrood House, and appointed Mr. Galloway to be one of the ministers of Edinburgh.

1608.—No sooner had one clerical disturbance been quelled, or at least smothered for the time being, than some new division occurred to distract James's peaceful government, and to increase the schisms which rent and distracted the "holy discipline." The popish lords Errol, Huntly, and Angus, had been for years exposed to the persecution of the presbyterians; and having been goaded by their continual clamour and inquisitorial interference, they broke out into acts of retaliation, and made no secret of their attachment to the church of Rome, and many of the people returned to that church, and sheltered themselves under their protection. This being represented to the monarch, whose anxious desire was to compose all the feuds and differences in his dominions, he ordered an Assembly to meet at Linlithgow, in July, and sent the earls of Dunbar, Winton, and Lothian, as his commissioners. The bishop of Orkney was elected the moderator, who declared that the king's object in convoking the present Assembly was to take cognizance of the growth of popery in all parts of the kingdom, and its alarming increase, by the return of many to the bosom of that church. That the church of Rome made many converts at that time, is not by any means surprising, from the devoted fervour of the jesuits, who were concealed in all parts of the kingdom in vast numbers, and under various pretexts, for making proselytes and extending the power and influence of the see of Rome, to accomplish which their vow binds them to compass sea and land. It may also not unreasonably be ascribed to that wretched state of anarchy and confusion which the holy discipline had stimulated combined with the doctrines taught by those of the Geneva school, on the dark topics of election and reprobation, or the eternal decree, as it is called. The greatest number of the papists were in the

northern parts, under the protection of the earl of Huntly, who was accordingly excommunicated[1].

After this unjustifiable stretch of ecclesiastical tyranny, the brethren instituted a minute inquiry into *their own* manifold backslidings, "in beating down Christ, putting him in bonds, covering his face purposing to bury him with the Jews;" when it was lamentably discovered to arise from the entire negligence of teaching and catechising the young; the too sudden admission of young men into the ministry; and the utter distraction, that is, the spirit of sedition and turbulence, by which those were actuated who were admitted to the ministry. Among the remedies proposed, it was resolved that the ministers should apply themselves diligently to the instruction of youth, by that best of all modes, catechising, especially to instruct them in the Belief, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, all of which had been neglected or despised, to make room for preaching, for which the Geneva school has always been noted. "And for the present distractions in the church, seeing the same did arise partly from a diversity of opinions touching an external government, and partly from divided affections, they were all, in the fear of God, exhorted to lay down all rancour and grudges, and to be cordially reconciled to each other, which all present promised by holding up their hands[2]." In this Assembly the cause of episcopacy advanced, and the bishops gained several advantages; for they were confirmed as constant commissioners to the General Assembly, and permanent moderators of their presbyteries and synods.

The Assembly drew up a petition to the king, requesting "that a commission should be granted to each of the bishops within his own diocese, and to such well-affected noblemen, barons, and gentlemen, as the commissioners of Assembly should nominate, for apprehending of jesuits, seminary priests, excommunicated papists, and traffickers against religion; that excommunicate papists be closely imprisoned, and none have access to them but well-affected persons." This petition, and an address from the Assembly, were presented to the king at Hampton Court, by the archbishop of Glasgow and several noblemen and ministers, who were very graciously received, and the petition was granted. The king addressed the deputies, saying, "that the difference between the lawful and unlawful meetings was easily perceptible by the fruits arising from both; for as that unlawful conventicle at Aberdeen had caused a schism in the church, and given the enemies of reli-

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. 505. [2] Ibid. b. vii. p. 505.—Calderwood.

gion a great advantage, so in this Assembly they had not only joined in love among themselves, which is the main point of religion, but also had taken a solid course for repressing of popery and superstition: that he did allow all their petitions, and would give order for a convention, which should ratify the conclusions of the Assembly; assuring them, that the church, keeping that course, should never lack his patrocinie and protection." The council was immediately directed to publish his majesty's acceptance of the Assembly's proceedings; and enjoined to commit Huntly, Errol, and Angus, to different castles[1].

1609.—In the parliament held this year at Edinburgh, several acts were passed in favour of the church; some of them, however, lacked that spirit of charity and forbearance which should characterize ecclesiastical statutes. But at that time, and for many years after, toleration for other men's opinions was unknown both in theory and practice; and, even so late as the reign of Queen Anne, it was openly declared, that "to grant toleration was to establish iniquity by law." By these statutes, noblemen were enjoined, under very heavy penalties, to send their sons abroad to travel only in those countries where the reformed religion was established; and that the tutors sent with them should be chosen and licensed by the bishop of the diocese where they resided: that none should succeed to property who were *suspected* of popery, till they produced a bishop's certificate of their being sound in the faith: and, lastly, those who were excommunicated for nonconformity should be deprived of their estates[2]. This was a hard and unjust law, and not much to the credit of the age, or of the church; and, in effect, it threw the fire of persecution on the secular arm. Excommunication was then unmercifully dealt out at the vindictive dictation of a set of aspiring brethren, who frequently wielded that dangerous weapon at the instigation of private revenge, and subjected individuals incurring it to the unjust vengeance of the law.

During the latter years of Elizabeth's reign, while James's succession was precarious, and subject, in some degree, to her caprice, Lord Balmerino had carried on a clandestine correspondence with the see of Rome, and had even surreptitiously procured James's signature to a letter addressed, with all his apostolical titles, to pope Clement VIII. He wrote to the pope in the king's name in the year 1598, to solicit him to

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 509.—Balfour's Annals, ii. 25-29.
[2] Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 510.—Calderwood, p. 601.

bestow a cardinal's hat on a Mr. Chisholme, a Scotsman, but who then held a bishopric in France. Elizabeth heard of the letter, and with her usual jealousy challenged it as contrary to his duty as a protestant sovereign. James disavowed it, as, indeed, he knew nothing of it; but afterwards, in his controversy with Bellarmine, that cardinal accused him of renouncing the mild and tolerating sentiments which he had expressed in his letter to Clement, and of having disappointed the hopes therein suggested of becoming a convert to the church of Rome. Lord Balmerino confessed that the letter was concerted without the knowledge of his master, and which was presented to James among other public papers, and subscribed without his knowledge of its contents. Balmerino was sent down to Scotland to be tried, when he was found guilty of the "treasonable, surreptitious, fraudulent, and false stealing of his majesty's hand to a letter directed to pope Clement VIII." He was condemned; but his life was spared at the intercession of the queen[1], and after a slight imprisonment, he was permitted to reside on his own estate. He died of grief about two years afterwards. On the 24th of June, the earl marshal, as the king's commissioner, held a parliament, when the acts of the late convention were ratified, the jurisdiction of the commissaries or bishops was restored to the church, and a statute made for the apparel of churchmen, judges, and magistrates. Patterns of these were sent from London; and all the parties concerned were ordered to provide themselves with the prescribed habits within a certain time, under pain of rebellion[2].

1610.—James's care for the church of his native kingdom was unremitting, and unaltered either by change of scene, or by distance. He had long regretted and severely felt, the entire want of order and decency in its government. Every minister was a pope in his own parish; and every turbulent, factious individual among them could easily embroil the whole kingdom either by an obstinate opposition to the civil or ecclesiastical laws, or by raising a simulated alarm of the king's "defection to popery." "When they," [the presbyterians] says a presbyterian author, "beheld apostates loaded with honours and emoluments, it was natural for them to rouse *their army*—THE PEOPLE—for the purpose of yet degrading foes, [the bishops] against whom their indignation became continually more fierce and more inveterate[3]." It is much to be lamented, that the people were so frequently appealed to in the Scottish reforma-

[1] Calderwood, 601.—Spottiswood, b. vii. 511.—Balfour's Annals, ii. 29, 30.
[2] Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 512. [3] Heron.

tion, and which, perhaps, may be one of the causes of the spiritual pride that reigns there. Lawful governors, whether civil or ecclesiastical, never appeal to the people, because the people are to be governed; whereas usurpers, both in the commonwealth and in the church, invariably "rouse their army," and by stimulating the fierce and uncharitable passions of the people, they introduce by clamour, intimidation, and force of numbers, measures of innovation against those institutions which have the advantage of antiquity, universality, and consent. To remedy the intolerable disorders consequent on the holy discipline, the king was daily, by his letters, urging the titular bishops to take on them vigorously the administration of ecclesiastical affairs; but they evinced considerable disinclination to act vigorously without the sanction of the General Assembly, on account of the popular clamour and the pragmatical opposition which they met with from the sincerer sort in their dioceses.

On the 6th of June an Assembly met by royal proclamation at Glasgow; the earl of Dunbar, the lord president of the Court of Session, and Sir Alexander Hay, principal secretary of state, having been appointed royal commissioners, the king addressed a circular "missive" to all the presbyteries: that, "being advertised of great confusion arising in the church by reason of the loose unsettled government which is therein, and being entreated by sundry of our good subjects, bishops, ministers, and others, for license to some general meeting of the church, wherein hope is given us that some good course, by common consent, shall be taken of all misorders and divisions of mind that hath so long continued among the ministry, to the great scandal of their profession, should cease and be extinguished; we have been pleased to yield to their request, and have granted liberty for a General Assembly to be holden at Glasgow the 8th day of January next: and therefore we will and require you, to make choice of the most wise, discreet, and peaceably disposed ministers among you . . . . . to advise . . . . . anent the late eruptions, to communicate to our commissioners the estate of every church within any of the same, the maintenance allowed thereto . . . . . and what is the best course to be taken for the ready payment of the ministers, so as they be not distracted from their charges, and forced to attend the law by discussing of suspensions, &c. . . . . And because, by our letters, we have particularly acquainted the archbishop of St. Andrews with our purpose herein, and sent unto him a special note of the names of such as we desire to be at our meeting; it is our pleasure that ye

conform yourselves thereto, and make choice of the persons that ye take to be fittest for giving advice in all matters[1]." Spottiswood, titular archbishop of Glasgow, was elected moderator. The commissioners proposed certain points of discipline for discussion, by his majesty's command, "that all things might thereafter be done orderly in the church, and with that consent and harmony which was fitting among preachers." After a debate which lasted three days, the Assembly agreed to and enacted the following nine articles:—

1. The Assembly did acknowledge the indiction of all such General Assemblies of the church to belong to his majesty by the prerogative of his crown; and all convocations in that kind without his licence, to be merely unlawful, condemning the conventicle at Aberdeen in 1605, as having no warrant from his majesty, and contrary to the prohibition he had given.

2. That synods shall be kept in every diocese twice in the year, viz. in April and October; the archbishop or bishop to be moderator. And when the dioceses are so large that the ministers cannot all conveniently assemble at one place, that the archbishop or bishop shall appoint a constant moderator.

3. That no sentence of excommunication or absolution from the same, shall be pronounced against, or in favour of, any person, without the knowledge and approbation of the bishop of the diocese, who must answer to God and his majesty for the formal and impartial proceeding thereof. And the process being found formal, that the sentence be pronounced at the bishop's direction by the minister of the parish where the offender hath his dwelling and the process did first begin.

4. That all presentations in time coming be directed to the archbishop or bishop wherein the lapsed benefice lieth, with power to the archbishop or bishop to dispone or confer the benefice, after the lapse, *jure devoluto*.

5. That in the deposition or suspension of ministers, the bishop shall associate with himself some ministers within the bounds where the delinquent serveth, and after just trial of the facts and merits, pronounce sentence of deprivation. The like order to be observed in the suspension of ministers from the exercise of their functions.

6. That every minister at his admission swear obedience to his majesty and to his ordinary [bishop] according to the form agreed on anno 1571.

7. That the bishops visit their dioceses themselves; and where too extensive, that he appoint one to visit in his place;

[1] Calderwood, 621—622.

and if any minister, without just cause or lawful excuse, shall absent himself from the visitation or diocesan assemblies, he shall be suspended from his office and benefice, and if persisted in, deprived.

8. That in the conventions of ministers for exercise, the bishop, being present, shall preside, or, in his absence, by one of his synod of his nomination.

9. And, lastly, that no minister shall speak against any of the foresaid conclusions in public, nor dispute the question of equality or inequality of ministers, as tending only to the entertainment of schism in the church, and the violation of the peace thereof[1].

These articles were agreed to almost unanimously; and this Assembly, which was free and perfectly uncontroled, placed it beyond the power of any future faction in the church to alter the foundation which was then laid for the episcopal government of the church *in all time coming*. The deliberation continued several days, and the Assembly adopted the articles so unanimously, that there were only *three* who voted against them, whilst 137 were for them. The presbyterian party were quite aware that the acts of this Assembly were fatal to their cause, and therefore Calderwood has indignantly recorded the names of all the noblemen and ministers, "who concurred at this meeting, to *the damnable conclusions* following[2]." For the execration of all presbyterians for all generations. After these conclusions had been agreed to, and the business of the Assembly disposed of, the permanent moderators of presbyteries complained to the earl of Dunbar, that the stipends *promised* to them had never been paid since the year 1606, for which he excused himself, by alleging absence. However, he paid the whole of their *arrears*, and discontinued their services, as the bishops were now legally the moderators. The sincerer sort immediately asserted, that the payment of this *just debt* was corruption and bribery". Spottiswood says, certain of the discontented sort did interpret the payment of this debt to be *a sort of* corruption, giving out, 'that this was done for obtaining the ministers' voices:' howbeit the *debt* was known to be *just*, and that *no motion* was made of that business before the aforesaid conclusions were enacted[3]." Calderwood is furious at both the payers and the receivers of the arrears of salary, and says, "Money was given largely to such as served the king and the bishops' turn, under pretence of bearing their charges . . . . The con-

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. 512.—Calderwood, 531. [2] Calderwood, 625—632.
[3] Spottiswood, b. vii. 513.

stant moderators, so many as were present, got every one their hundredth pounds Scots, *which was promised* at the convention holden anno 1606 at Linlithgow[1]." This admission confutes the whole of the accusation; and truly if so many members had been bribed by so small a sum distributed among a few, their appetite for corruption must have been large indeed. The synods and presbyteries did not submit to this new regulation without a great opposition by individual members of the sincerer sort; but the privy council issued a proclamation, commanding all, of whatsoever function, to obey the decision of the Glasgow Assembly[2]."

Soon after the dissolution of this Assembly, the king commanded the titular archbishop of Glasgow to select other two titulars, and repair to court. Accordingly, he chose the bishops of Brechin and Galloway. The titular bishops had been restored to their seats and votes in parliament, and the Glasgow Assembly had conferred on them more substantial power than they had hitherto enjoyed: but, as neither acts of parliament nor of Assembly can confer the spiritual character, of which they were wholly deficient, and which could only be conferred by the laying on of the hands of those who had themselves received it "from hand to hand from the apostles," according to the rules and canons of the primitive church, James determined that they should receive consecration at the hands of English bishops, whom he specially appointed for that purpose. The Scottish prelates arrived in September, and at their first audience the king informed them of his motives for calling them to London; and addressing them to the following effect, said—"That he had, to his great charge, recovered the bishoprics forth of the hands of those that possessed them, and bestowed the same on such as he hoped should prove worthy of their places; but, since he could not make them bishops, nor could they assume that honour themselves, and that in Scotland there was not a sufficient number to enter charge by consecration, he had called them to England, that, being consecrated themselves, they might at their return give ordination to those at home, and so the adversaries' mouths be stopped, who said that he did take upon him to create bishops and bestow spiritual offices, which he never did, nor would he presume to do, acknowledging that right to belong to Christ alone, and those he had authorised by his power."

To which the archbishop replied, in the name of the others, "that they were willing to obey his majesty's desires, but only

[1] Calderwood, 625.—Spottiswood, b. vii. 513. [2] Calderwood.

they feared that the church of Scotland, on account of former usurpations, might take this for a sort of subjection to the church of England." But the king's patriotic affection for his native church had foreseen that objection, and provided against it, by excluding the two archbishops of Canterbury and York (who alone might have claimed any such supremacy) from the commission. Heylin says, that Bancroft, who had chiefly forwarded the good work, very cheerfully agreed, not caring who participated in its honour, so long as the churches of both kingdoms might receive the benefit of it. The commission was directed to George Abbot, bishop of London, Launcelot Andrews, bishop of Ely, and James Montague, bishop of Bath and Wells, and they were appointed to consecrate the Scottish titulars in the chapel of London House, on the 21st of October. Balfour states the bishops to have been "London, Ely, Worcester, and Rochester[1]." Dr. Andrews, bishop of Ely, proposed that, previous to consecration, the Scottish bishops should be ordained presbyters, as the orders which they had received must be accounted null and void, the parties conferring them having had themselves no lawful mission. Archbishop Bancroft, who was present, objected to this proposal, inasmuch as the episcopal order included the two inferior degrees. He adduced the instances from antiquity, of Ambrose, archbishop of Milan, and Nectarius, patriarch of Constantinople, who were consecrated to the episcopal office without having been ordained as priests. This reasoning being allowed, or, as Spottiswood says, "having been applauded to by the rest," the Scottish prelates were duly consecrated, and became bishops in reality, their former ministrations in that character having been altogether an usurpation[2].

Calderwood maintains that this consecration was null and of no effect, because, says he, there was no mention of *consecration* in the Glasgow Assembly; "for howbeit *the unhappy pack there convened* tied presbyteries and synods unto them in the cases expressed, yet meant they not to determine that there was a distinct office of a bishop in the word differing from the office of a minister ..... The power granted to them was only a power derived from that convention, which another Assembly might take from them again without degradation or execration, as they call it. Their consecration, therefore, is of no force, and ought not to be acknowledged[3]." Such loose

[1] Balfour's Annals, ii. 35.

[2] Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 314.—Calderwood, 511.—Heylin, lib. xi. p. 382.—Perceval's Apostolical Succession.—Keith's Cat. p. 263.

[3] Calderwood, p. 614.

and Erastian notions were constantly maintained in both the Knoxian and Melvillian establishments; and it is to be regretted, that they are still prevalent in the present kirk.

At the same time, the king instituted a Court of High Commission. Lay elders were set aside, "considering they have neither warrant in the word of God, nor example of the primitive church;" and in their place the ministers were to make choice of fit persons in every parish for repairing the fabric of the church, providing elements for the holy communion, collecting contributions for the poor, and other necessary expenses. It was determined that no minister shall be admitted without an exact trial preceding, and *imposition of hands* used in their ordination by the bishop and two or three ministers; and that a form of ordination be printed and precisely followed by every bishop; that the election of bishops shall in time coming be made according to the conference anno 1571; that when it shall be thought expedient to call a General Assembly, a supplication be made to his majesty for license to convene; and that the said Assembly shall consist of bishops, deans, archdeacons, and such of the ministry as shall be selected by the rest. The archbishop and four ministers were to compose a quorum, who were to have cognizance of all ranks, and from whose decision there should be no appeal. The bishops were appointed visitors of schools and colleges; and they could suspend or deprive contumacious ministers as the case might require[1].

"The three consecrated bishops," says a venerable author, "on their return home, conveyed the episcopal powers, which they had now received in a canonical way, to their former titular brethren: to George Gladstanes, in St. Andrews; Peter Blackburn, in Aberdeen; Alexander Douglas, in Moray; George Graham, in Dunblane; David Lindsay, in Ross; Alexander Forbes, in Caithness; James Law, in Orkney; Alexander Lindsay, in Dunkeld; John Campbell, in Argyle; and Andrew Knox, in the Isles. Thus, after fifty years of confusion, and a multiplicity of turnings and windings, either to improve or to set aside the plan adopted in 1560, we see an episcopal church once more settled in Scotland, and a regular apostolic succession of episcopacy introduced, on the extinction of the old line [meaning the Roman Catholic], which had long before failed, without any attempt, real or pretended, to keep it up[2]."

The king had been long projecting this settlement, and had gone on, by gradual advances from one step to another, with

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 515. [2] Skinner's Eccl. Hist. ii. 253.

much patience and great perseverance to the last. Yet it cannot be said, that the education he received in his youth was such as would prejudice him in favour of episcopacy, or that it was the ambition of the clergy which prompted him to the re-establishment of it. It is true, many of them were, even in the times of the greatest confusion, well inclined to the primitive episcopal model, and sufficiently acquainted with early antiquity to see the expediency and necessity of it; but a few turbulent incendiaries, such as Melville, Black, and Bruce,—who, when they appear, will always find some abettors and followers, —were perpetually raising such clamours and disturbances, as deterred the quiet lovers of truth from entering the lists, to struggle with such fiery and unmanageable tempers; and had not the king, by his learning, been able to confute their licentious principles, as well as steady to the resolutions he had formed, these few fanatical levellers would have kept both church and state in a continual ferment. But his constancy carried his point, and he lived to see the good effects of his policy. The persons now invested with the episcopal character made it their business, both by their example and authority, to stem the tumultuous torrent of former times, and to preserve peace and harmony among all ranks of people under their charge; insomuch, that a presbyterian historian [Calderwood], contemporary with this solemn restoration of real episcopacy, makes a heavy complaint that by *far the greatest part of the nation submitted quietly to it*; and, happily, it was not in the power of the late democratical party for a long time to create any very powerful opposition to it.

Succession is the divine charter of the gospel priesthood, and is one of the *marks* of a *true* church. It is the duty, therefore, of every ambassador of Christ to be confident of his evidence, and of the people also to know whether they live under the conduct of such a ministry as may lawfully preach, administer the sacraments, absolve penitents, thrust out stubborn offenders, and preserve the faith "once delivered to the saints," and which can be no otherwise done than by the apostolical succession. But presbyters never received by their ordination authority to ordain others,—no word of God gives it to them,—and all the rules of the whole church take it from them;—therefore, their attempt to ordain without and against bishops must be void and of no effect, and only occasions schism by dividing the church upon an unjust cause. They could not receive the power of the keys from those who had no power to confer it; and therefore, in celebrating the eucharist, and baptizing, they did nothing but profane God's

ordinances. This profanation had been in fearful operation for a long period of time. In the papal church of Scotland, laymen were preferred to bishoprics who had not the apostolic grace; and it is to be feared that they ministered at the altar in holy things, and, considering the lax and Erastian opinions then prevalent, it is not improbable that these commendators, as the lay bishops were called, may have assisted at consecrations, and so vitiated the whole succession of the papal church in Scotland. This is a species of profanation that had long existed, and which called loudly for reformation and deep penitence; for from the laxity of the papal discipline, laymen of the most immoral lives were permitted to offer strange fire before the Lord, like Nadab and Abihu, the younger sons of Aaron, and whom the Lord devoured with fire, as a warning to all future generations that none should offer incense before Him but the seed of Aaron, or those who are called with the same divine authority that he was. After the demolition of the Roman church, down to the period at which we have now arrived, none but laymen without any kind of orders, or even the apostolic ceremony of the laying on of hands, had ever officiated, with the exception of Knox and a few of the early preachers who were in priests' orders. Erastianism and profanation came down from the first reformation like a torrent, and along with them every species of private immorality and public profligacy. Considering the age in which he lived, and the immorality with which he was surrounded, king James was a miracle of chastity and morality; and which was so astonishing to his people, that they could only account for it upon the principle that his chaste conduct proceeded from impotency[1].

From the age of twelve years, when he assumed the government, he had maintained a mortal struggle with the democratical Genevan party in the establishment. His adhesion to episcopacy arose from his conviction of its divine origin; a conclusion which, through divine grace, he arrived at from the study of the scriptures and the history of the church, with both of which he was well acquainted. He found that there is a more clear and unequivocal evidence for the divine institution of episcopal government than can be produced for the authenticity of the canon of scripture. The canonical books were not separated from the apocryphal till after the decease of the apostles, that is, till the second century; and some of the books were not received into the sacred canon even in the third century. Yet our Lord clearly indicated the canon of the Old

[1] Spottiswood, b. vi. 377.—Vide his own letter, ante, p. 336.

Testament:—"All things," said he, "must be fulfilled which were written in *the law of Moses*, and in *the Prophets*, and in *the Psalms*." If, therefore, it be found that episcopacy is of divine institution, it will follow as a natural consequence that ordination was always performed by bishops, but never without them; and that the form of ordinations by presbyters or priests without bishops, are null and of no effect. If this position be granted, how much more null and invalid, so to speak, must the Knoxian and Melvillian admissions have been, which were performed by men who had no canonical orders of any sort themselves, but who had unhappily despised and rejected even the apostolic rite of the imposition of hands. This state of things would not have been tolerated in the primitive church, when, as Knox justly said, "all things were carried order, and well."

Our belief of the authenticity of the canon of scripture rests entirely on the infallible *evidence* of the church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth, for we stand by faith in Christ. Our belief, therefore, that the sacred gospels and epistles are genuine, must necessarily depend on the credit and integrity of those who outlived the apostles, in the first instance, and on the *evidence* of the whole church ever since. But episcopacy has a fuller testimony on its side, and of a different description from that which demonstrates the validity of the canon of scripture. The evidence of episcopacy has ever been open and patent to every man's senses, whether learned or ignorant; no man could open his eyes and look about him without seeing the whole machinery of government, which was constantly descending in an unbroken line of succession. He could not help seeing that no sooner did one bishop die than another was consecrated in his place; and it was much easier to prove the existence and descent of bishops than it was to prove that any of the apostles or evangelists wrote the books which are ascribed to them. It is much easier to prove that James or Charles were kings of Scotland, and that monarchy was the form of government in all periods of our history, than to convince any one that the former was the author of Basilicon Doron, and the latter of Eikon Basilike. From the days of Knox, the ministers who had taken the places of the papal clergy were as Korah, and as strangers not of the seed of Aaron, who came near to offer incense before the Lord; and therefore the blood of the people was upon their heads. They were usurpers of the sacred office; hence the word of God which they preached was without power and authority, and the sacraments which they administered were without validity, and

conveyed no divine grace. The people could not be answerable for not hearkening to or not obeying the word of God as delivered by them, because they had no authority to preach it and that divine grace did not accompany their administration is evident on their own shewing, and their constant complaints that all the worst works of the flesh were fearfully prevalent among all ranks of the people. They could not make their people members of Christ by baptism, and so the adopted sons of God, nor convey the grace of justification or the remission of sin by that mystery, because they had no right to make a covenant in the name of Christ; hence the alienation of the people from God, and their own continual complaints of murders, adulteries, and incests. They could not administer the body and blood of Christ to the people, because they had no commission from Christ to consecrate bread and wine as the representatives of His body which was broken, and of his blood which was shed for the remission of sins. So that by usurping the ministerial functions without divine authority and commission, they became blind leaders of the blind; they deprived their people of the means of grace and all the sure and well-grounded hopes of future glory. The whole people seemed to have been given up to a reprobate mind; yet, in the midst of judgment, God remembered mercy, and inspired the heart of the king with a firm resolution to gather his people again within the ark of God; and his good intentions being well supported by the titular bishops and the better part of the ministers, whose hearts God had touched, the church which was conveyed to the greater part of England by bishops Aidan, Finan, and Colman, was restored to Scotland by their successors.

The papal succession, which had existed with more or less purity from St. Ninian, bishop of Galloway, who was consecrated by Martin, bishop of Tours, about the year 450, ended at the death of James Beaton, archbishop of Glasgow, in the year 1603. The long usurpation of the pope had given the papal hierarchy the unchristian impression, that no consecration of a bishop could be canonical or valid unless with the pope's authority and mandate. Hence the Scoto-papal hierarchy made no effort to continue their line of succession; and which may be devoutly contemplated as a merciful dispensation of Almighty Providence. From the monstrous corruption of the papacy in permitting the bishoprics to be filled with *laymen without any holy orders*, it is evident that the Scottish papal hierarchy

was not pure, and therefore a succession flowing through such a channel would have tainted the whole stream. We have also reason to bless God that they suffered their church to be extinguished, and no succession to be kept up, in the three kingdoms, which has prevented the guilt of schism on our part —a guilt which is now thrown incontestibly on the heads of the papists themselves, by their having, at a great distance of time, introduced missionary bishops from the churches of Italy and Spain, and who are not at all connected with the catholic church of the united kingdom.

The "holy discipline" of Melville was entirely democratical in its formation and tendency, and was totally different from the pseudo-episcopal "evangel" of Knox; and it is a melancholy fact, that wherever the former has been settled, it was always introduced by the sword and sedition. It so commenced in Geneva, where it was originally invented; from thence the same turbulent spirit disturbed the peace of France, the Netherlands, Scotland, and lastly of England. In the few years which elapsed from Melville's appearance until the period at which we have now arrived, we have seen little else than sedition, and even open rebellion, as the *fruit* which distinguished its origin; for by its fruit must a tree be known. Sedition, resistance to the sovereign powers, and open rebellion and murder, are not the fruits of the Spirit, but these fruits sprung incontestibly from the holy discipline, and therefore we are fully warranted in concluding that it was not of God. The church is represented in Scripture as "a sea of glass like unto crystal," pure, placid, peaceable—as a "pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb;" typifying the everlasting settled state of the pious and the just, and as such free from those sudden miry floods which swell and pollute the stream of temporal rivers; whereas the symbolical sea of the holy discipline was turbulent and restless, ever casting up mire and dirt, which being deprived of the gentle fertilizing rains and soft dews of God's Holy Spirit, fell, from the violent excitement in which it began, into absolute infidelity. Voltaire boasted that in "Calvin's own town, in his day, there were but a few beggarly fellows who believed in Christ, and that from Geneva to Berne *not a christian was to be found!*" The late principal Rose, of King's College, London, says, the German "divines . . . . . have *rejected all belief* in the divine origin of christianity;" and he adds, that "Mr. Stuart, of Andover, in America, states the same fact, in very strong terms, with respect to the

students in his own country[1]." The General Assembly of 1601 expressly acknowledged that the presbyterian discipline "must at last terminate either in popery or atheism." Indeed, the holy discipline has, ever since its invention, had a regular and progressive downward tendency to atheism; and accordingly this tendency has ever been the constant complaint of all the good and pious men of its communion. The late Dr. M'Crie, in a public protest of the religious community of seceders, of which he was a sort of head or chief leader, lamented its existence at the present day. "The synod," he says, "condemns the voluntary system" on account of its *atheistical character and tendency*[3]. To this may be added the testimony of Dr. Walker, late bishop of Edinburgh, who says, "No system of faith, refined by the exclusive and excessive zeal of a party, retains, for a hundred years successively, its original import, colour, and influence, as may be easily verified by considering the present state of the Calvinistic or reformed churches abroad and in our own island, by comparing the present sentiments of the large majority of their successors with the confession and the sentiments of the Westminster Assembly and of their immediate followers; while the church of England, claiming no dominion over our faith, nor presuming to enforce partial and exclusive comments, *has preserved substantial truth* more perfectly and more generally than any other national church among the reformed[4]."

But even admitting, for the sake of argument merely, that the so-called holy discipline had been the apostolic, and therefore the divine institution of the church's government, yet the long continuance of the episcopal regimen, even from the apostolic era, would be fatal to the Melvillian scheme. It is undeniable, that if the presbyterian system had been apostolic, it must have been in abeyance for fifteen centuries, and at the time when it was renewed by Calvin, Beza, and Melville, there was no such discipline in existence in any part of the world. None of these men could produce any evidence that they had any divine commission to restore the long-lost holy discipline, and there were no presbyterian ministers to show their succession from any presbytery which might have been established by the apostles. It will not do to say, that men who had been episcopally ordained could restore that which was lost, be-

[1] State of Protestantism in Germany, p. 2. [2] Ante, ch. xi. p. 422.
[3] Vindication of the Principles of the Church of Scotland in relation to questions recently agitated, 1850. [4] Life of Whitgift.

cause, upon Beza's principles, episcopacy is a *satanical* emanation; and therefore, if presbytery came through this satanical episcopacy, presbytery is as far in the wrong, and as much a satanical institution, as episcopacy is said to be. But the matter is not improved by the notorious fact that these three men were mere *laymen*, and therefore were greater "gainsayers" than even Korah himself, who was a priest, but wanted to assume the office of the *high* priest, and establish a holy discipline. If presbytery is the divine government of the church, then it cannot be denied that its Great Head had entirely broken His solemn parting promise, of being with it "alway, even unto the end of the world;" for it ceased to exist for fifteen centuries. This breach of promise will be readily granted by both parties to be an impossibility—for God is truth itself, and its fountain; and both will readily agree, that to accuse Him of suffering his church throughout the whole world to be extinguished, and the gates of hell thus to prevail, is a grievous sin. But to maintain that episcopacy is satanical, as Beza and Melville asserted, and an antichristian tyranny which ought to be extirpated, as the solemn league and covenant says, is to invert the apostle's words, and practically to assert that God is a liar[1]. This is a dreadful conclusion to arrive at, and it becomes the followers of Melville to look well to the position in which they have placed themselves by having left their first love. Let them be entreated, therefore, to remember from whence they are fallen, and to repent and do their first works, that their candlestick may be restored to them, and themselves restored to the communion of the church catholic, from which they are at present entirely cut off.

[1] Romans, iii. 4.

CHAPTER XII.

PRIMACY OF GLADSTANES AND SPOTTISWOOD.

1611.—Consecrations of the bishops.—First sitting of the high commission.—Discontent of the nobles and the presbyterian party.—Constitution of the court.——1612.—The law of excommunication repealed.—Archbishop Gladstanes' letter to the king.—Parliament.—Acts of the Glasgow Assembly ratified.—Acts of 1592, establishing the holy discipline, repealed.—Marriage of the Princess Sophia.—Death of Henry Prince of Wales.——1613.—King James excommunicated by the pope.—Death of bishop Hamilton, of Galloway—Succeeded by William Cowper.—Death of bishop Lindsay, of Ross.——1614.—Death of James Melville.—Easter observed.—Oglevie the jesuit.—Examination of Oglevie.—The king's instructions and questions.—Oglevie's answers—Tried by the provost and bailies—Arraigned for high treason—His defence—Found guilty, and executed.—Some resemblances noticed.—Moffat banished.——1615.—Communion on Easter Day.—Death of archbishop Gladstanes—His Character.—Spottiswood translated to St. Andrews—Several translations.—Malcom tried for seditious preaching.——1616.—Absolution of the Marquis of Huntly.—Disputes between the chancellor and the clergy.—King's explanation.—Archbishop of Canterbury's letter, and form of absolution.—Huntly absolved in Scotland.—Death of Blackburn, bishop of Aberdeen.—Alexander Forbes consecrated bishop of Aberdeen.—An Assembly.—A liturgy ordered to be compiled.—Some other regulations proposed, but their adoption deferred.—Jesuits.—Marquis of Huntly reconciled.—Archbishop of Spalato.——1617.—The king intimates his intention of visiting Scotland.—Portraits of the apostles.—Popular indignation.—King's arrival.—Parliament.—King's speech.—Lords of the articles.—Laws regarding the church opposed by the bishops.—Consternation of the presbyterian party.—Intemperate sermon of Struthers.—Some brethren protest.—Parliament dissolved.—Severe measures against the malcontent brethren.—The communion administered kneeling.—Liturgy used in the chapel royal.—Meeting of the king and the bishops at St. Andrews.—King's speech.—An Assembly proposed—The king's objections—Permits an Assembly to meet—The meeting—Some acts passed.—The king displeased.—The king's letter (note).—Severe measures.—Reflections.—The king's second letter—His opinion of the acts.—Archbishop preaches on Christmas Day.—Dissatisfaction of the presbyterian party.—Simpson submits, and is discharged.—Bishop of Aberdeen dies.—Succeeded by Forbes, of Corse.—James's mode of selecting the bishops.——1618.—An episcopal synod.—Petition for another Assembly.—Good Friday observed.—Communion received kneeling on Easter Day and Whitsunday.—Assembly at Perth.—Lord Binning

Commissioner.—The king's letter.—The five articles of Perth.—Lord Binning's letter to the king.—Passive resistance of the presbyterian party.—Ancient observation of the christian festivals.—Some reflections.——1619.—Comet.—Death of the queen.—The articles still resisted, and become a cause of discontent.—Awkward coincidence of the five points condemned by the synod of Dort.—Synod of Dort.—The doctrines of Calvin peculiar to presbytery.—Arminius—The five points—Advantage taken of that synod.—Condemnation of Arminius.—A parochial meeting.—Death of Cowper, bishop of Galloway.—Lindsay made bishop of Brechin.——1621.—Discontent of the presbyterians.—A fast.—Perth articles ratified in parliament.—Some ministers committed.—The king's letter to the bishops and council.—Great storm.——1622-21.—Willian Rigge summoned before the privy council.—Conventicles prohibited.——1625.—Death of king James—His last hours—His character—accused of deserting the kirk—His own contradiction.

1611.—On Sunday the 13th of January, and on Sunday the 24th of February, the other bishops were consecrated at St. Andrews and Leith by Spottiswood, archbishop of Glasgow: Lamb, bishop of Brechin, and Hamilton, bishop of Galloway, "after the same manner that they were consecrated themselves. But the consecration of the first three being null, the rest that followed are null also[1]." Such is the opinion of the presbyterian Calderwood, and had his premises been correct his conclusion would be undeniable; but he is entirely mistaken in his reasoning; nevertheless it is considered unanswerable by his party.

This great work reflects immortal honour on James's peaceful reign; and his tenacity of purpose and ability in bringing it to a conclusion shew that he was a far superior man than the malignant pens of some his contemporary historians have represented him. Immediately after the consecration of the bishops at London, James erected a Court of High Commission for ordering all ecclesiastical matters that did not come within the jurisdiction of the bishops' courts. He also gave some directions for the better exercise of their authority, and appointed this court to sit for the first time in February of this year. At a meeting of the bishops and some of the principal clergy in Edinburgh in February, the following royal directions were approved, and adopted as a national rubric in ecclesiastical affairs:—

1. That every particular matter should not be brought at first before the High Commission, nor any thing moved unto it, except the same was appealed unto, or complained of by one

[1] Calderwood, p. 644.

of the bishops as a thing that could not be rectified in their diocese; or then some enormous offence, in the trial whereof the bishops should be found too remiss.

2. That every archbishop and bishop should make his residence at the cathedral church of his diocese, and labour so far as they could and were able, to repair the same.

3. That all archbishops and bishops be careful in visitation of their diocese, and every third year at least take inspection of the ministers, readers, and others, serving cure within their bounds.

4. That each of the archbishops visit their province every seven years at least.

5. Whereas there be in sundry dioceses some churches belonging to other bishops, that care be taken to exchange the churches one with another, that all the dioceses may be contiguous, if possible the same may be performed. As likewise in regard some dioceses are too large, and others have a small number of churches, scarce deserving of the title of a diocese; and that a course be taken for enlarging the same in a reasonable proportion, by uniting the nearest churches of the greater diocese thereto.

6. That the convention of ministers for the exercise of doctrine exceed not the number of ten or twelve at most, and over them a moderator be placed by the ordinary of the diocese, where the said conventions are licensed, with power to call before them all scandalous persons within that precinct, and censure and correct offenders according to the canons of the church: yet are not these moderators to proceed in any case either to excommunication or suspension, without the allowance of the ordinary. And if it shall be tried that these ministers do usurp any further power than is permitted, or carry themselves unquietly, either in teaching or otherwise, at these meetings, in that case the bishop shall discharge the meeting and censure the offenders according to the quality of the fault.

7. Considering that lay elders have neither warrant in the word of God, nor example of the primitive church, and that nevertheless it is expedient that some be appointed to assist the minister, in repairing the fabric of the church, providing elements for the holy communion, and collecting the contributions for the poor, with other necessary services, the minister is to make choice of the most wise and discreet persons in the parish to that effect, and present their names to the ordinary, that his approbation may be had thereto.

8. That the ministers of the parish be authorised to call

before them and their associates, so allowed, all public and notorious offenders, and enjoin the satisfaction according to the canons of the church; or if they be obstinate and contumacious, declare their names to their bishop, that order may be taken with them.

9. That no minister be admitted without an exact trial preceding, and imposition of hands used in their ordination by the bishop and two or three ministers whom he shall call to assist the service: and to the end an uniform order may be kept in the admission of ministers, that a form thereof may be imprinted and precisely followed by every bishop.

10. That the elections of bishops shall in time coming be made according to the conference anno 1571, and whilst the bishopric remaineth void, the dean of the chapter be *vicarius in omnibus ad episcopatum pertinentibus*, and have the custody of the living and rents, till the same be of new provided.

11. That the dean of every diocese convene the chapter thereof once at least in the year, and take order that nothing pass except they be *capitulariter congregati*; and that a register be made of every thing done by the archbishop or bishop in the administration of the rents, and kept safely in the chapter-house.

12. That when it shall be thought expedient to call a General Assembly, a supplication be put up to his majesty for license to convene; and that the said Assembly consist of bishops, deans, archdeacons, and such of the ministry as shall be elected by the rest.

13. And because there hath been a general abuse in that church, that youths, having passed their course in philosophy, before they have attained to the years of discretion, or received lawful ordination by imposition of hands, do engage themselves to preach, that a strict order be taken for restraining all such persons, and none be permitted but those that have received orders to preach ordinarily and in public[1].

The Court of High Commission gave great offence to the proud nobility, who considered it an infringement of their hereditary rights, and a diminution of their power and influence, that the bishops and clergy should be raised to so high stations in the state. In this discontent they were readily joined by the presbyterian party, who murmured loudly when they began to feel that the glory of their former tyranny was gone, and their republican papacy cut up by the roots. They derived some

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 574—75.

crumbs of comfort, however, in the death of the earl of Dunbar[1], on whose memory Calderwood pours out the envenomed indignation of a most malignant and unchristian heart[2]. Andrew Melville also was released from the Tower, after four years' confinement, and allowed to emigrate to Sedan, where he died, neither much respected nor regretted; nevertheless, he left his sting behind him, which rankled in the body politic, and produced in the following reign a most loathsome sore[3].

The presbyterian brethren had passed an act of Assembly, ordaining that all persons who were fugitive for capital crimes, should be excommunicated, unless they answered in person the summons of the church courts: although that was impossible, from the risk of capture by the civil judicatories, and consequent danger of their lives from the laws. James being convinced of the injustice and tyranny of this abominable law, wrote to the bishops, pointing out its absurdity and iniquity, and recommended them to procure its abrogation. "The ecclesiastical censure of excommunication," said he, "which should be inflicted upon such as having committed any scandalous offence are contemners of the church, is, as we have been informed, so far abused against the first institution, that we cannot sufficiently marvel at the proceeding said to be commonly used among you; namely, that persons fugitive for capital crimes being cited before ecclesiastical judicatories although it be known that they dare not compear for fear of their life, are sentenced as persons contumacious, whereas the fear they stand in ought in reason to excuse their absence, since they cannot be judged contemners of the church, who, upon just terrors, are kept back from giving their personal appearance . . . . . Our will and pleasure is, there be no such form of proceeding used among you[4]."

[1] Of whom archbishop Spottiswood says, "he was a man of deep wit, few words, and in his majesty's service no less faithful than fortunate. The most difficile affairs he compassed without any noise, and never returned when he was employed without the work performed that he was sent to do."

[2] Calderwood, p. 644, says, "the earl of Dunbar, a chief instrument employed for the overthrow of the discipline of our kirk, departed this life at Winyhal, the penult of Januar. So he was pulled down from the height of his honour, when he was about to solemnize magnificently his daughter's marriage with the lord Walden. He purposed to keep St. George's-day after, in Berwick, where he had almost finished a sumptuous and glorious palace, which standeth as a monument to testify that the curse which was pronounced against the rebuilders of Jericho was executed upon him. Of all that he conquissed in Scotland, there is not left to his posterity so much as a foot-breadth of land. His death bred an alteration in state affairs; sundry of the council, as well bishops as others, went up to court in the month of March after, every one for his own particular."

[3] Calderwood, 615.—Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 575.

[4] Spottiswood, b. vii. 578.

On receipt of the king's letter, the archbishop of St. Andrews convened the bishops and some of the clergy, when, after considerable opposition, it was agreed that, as "the principal end of all church censures, especially of excommunication, was the reclaiming of offenders, and the bringing of them to the acknowledgment of their sin, ... they did therefore judge it more safe, in these cases, to advertise people of the heinousness of the act committed, warning them to make their own profit thereof, and to forbear all proceedings against the fugitive person till his condition should be made known." The act was therefore repealed, and the ministers were inhibited from following out any process against fugitives in future[1].

1612.—The church now, at last, enjoyed temporary rest; and Calderwood cannot find any thing with which to fill up the history of this year till the meeting of parliament, but a letter from archbishop Gladstanes to the king, which bears all the marks of a forgery[2]. Men who could fabricate such enormous falsehoods as he and other historians of his opinions have done, would not hesitate at either composing a letter in the archbishop's name, or of receiving one from others knowing it to be fabricated, to injure and disgrace the church. But if

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. 517, 518.

[2] Calderwood's True History, p. 645. "Most gracious Sovereign,—As it hath pleased your majesty to direct me and my lord your majesty's secretary, for advising anent our affairs to be handled in this approaching parliament: so happily did I find him and my lord of Glasgow both in this town, and convened them both immediately after my arriving, and with good advertisement we have made choice of those things which are most necessary, and have omited those articles which may seem to carry envy or suspicion, or which your majesty by your royal authority might perform by yourself. But all hold fast this conclusion, that it is most necessary and convenient, both for your majesty's service and the well of the kirk, that the day—viz. the 12th of October—shall hold precisely to the which the parliament was proclaimed upon the 21th of this instant. I will assure your majesty that the very evil will which is carried to my lord chancellor by the nobility and people, is like to make us great store of friendship; for they know him to be our professed enemy, and he dissembleth it not. I thank God that it pleased your majesty to make choice of my lord secretary to be our formalist and adviser of our acts; for we find him wise, fast, and secret. We will not be idle in the meantime to prepare such as have vote, to incline the right way. All men do follow us and hunt for our favour, upon the report of your majesty's good acceptance of me and the bishop of Caithness; and sending for my lord of Glasgow, and the procurement of this parliament without advice of the chancellor. And if your majesty will continue these shining beams and shews of your majesty's favour, doubtless the very purpose that seemeth most difficult will be facilitate to your majesty's great honour and our credit; which, if it were greater than it is, your majesty would receive no interest. For besides that no estate may say that they are your majesty's creatures, as we may say, so there is none whose standing is so slippery when your majesty shall frown, as we; for at your majesty's nod we must either stand or fall. But we refer the more ample declaration of these purposes and other points of your majesty's service, to the sufficiency of my lord of Glasgow and my good lord secretary, the fourteenth

archbishop Gladstanes really did write this letter, which we do not believe, as no allusion is made to it by Spottiswood, he was a very unfit person to be a christian bishop, and the head of a national church.

In the month of October parliament met at Edinburgh, the lord chancellor representing the king; when the acts of the Glasgow Assembly were confirmed and ratified, and all the acts and constitutions in favour of presbytery, especially the act of 1592, which established it, were rescinded and annulled, in so far as they, or any of them, or any part of the same, were derogatory to the articles then concluded.

"At this parliament," says Calderwood, "the act of Glasgow, under the colour of explanation, was impaired, enlarged, or altered; so that, in effect, it was a new act, different from that of Glasgow . . . . and, therefore, an act passed without consent of the kirk[1]." A large subsidy was granted to the king in this parliament, on account of the Princess Elizabeth's intended marriage with Frederick, the fifth elector palatine of the Rhine, and king of Bohemia. She was the mother of the Princess Sophia, who married Ernest Augustus, Duke of Brunswick-Luxembourgh, Elector of Hanover, from whom is descended the present illustrious lady who fills the British throne. The popish faction made great opposition to the grant of this subsidy, on account of their dislike to the princess's marriage with a protestant prince, as they had views of filling the throne with a papist through her marriage with some of the popish princes. The marriage was postponed, however, and the court thrown into mourning, by the unexpected death of the prince of Wales, in the beginning of November, at St. James's, at the early age of eighteen years and eight months, greatly lamented both at home and abroad,—"a prince of excellent virtues, and all the perfections that can be wished for in youth[2]," and "whose death was lamented by the most generous princes in christendom[3]." It was, however, strongly suspected that poison had been administered to him. He was interred

bishop of this kingdom. But my lord of Glasgow and I are contending to which of the two provinces he shall appertain. Your majesty, who is our great archbishop, must decide it. Thus, after my most humble and hearty thanks for your majesty's good acceptance and gracious despatch lately, which hath filled the ears of all this kingdom, I beseech God to heap upon your majesty the plenty of all spiritual and temporal blessings for ever. I rest,

"Your majesty's most humble subject and servitour,

"*Edinburgh, the last of August*, 1612." "S. ANDREWS."

[1] Calderwood, 646. [2] Spottiswood, b. vii. 329.
[3] Balfour's Annals, ii. 40.

at Westminster with great pomp; and his brother, Prince Charles, Duke of York, acted as chief mourner.

1613.—On the 14th February, being Shrove Tuesday, the Princess Elizabeth's marriage was solemnized at Whitehall, at the age of seventeen, having been born in Scotland on the 19th August, 1596[1]. Lord Binning, principal secretary of state, informed some of the clergy that the king had been excommunicated by the pope, and was, therefore, liable to be assassinated whenever an opportunity presented itself to any zealous papist. It proved, however, to be a false alarm at that time. Gavin Hamilton, bishop of Galloway, who was consecrated at London in 1610, died this year. The revenue of his see being small, the king gave him, by letters patent, the abbey of Dundrennan, the priory of Whithorne, and, Calderwood says, also the abbeys of Tungland and Glenluce. Bishop Keith says, "he was an excellent, good man;" but Calderwood says, "he died with little sense." He was succeeded by William Coupar, minister first of Bothkennar, in the county of Stirling, and afterwards minister of Perth. He was also made dean of the chapel-royal, and resided chiefly in the Canongate. David Lindsay, bishop of Ross, also died in October this year, in the eighty-third year of his age. "He was a grave and pious man, and was the person who baptized King Charles I." He was "of a peaceable nature, and greatly favoured of the king, to whom he performed divers good services, especially in the troubles he had with the church; a man universally beloved, and well esteemed by all wise men. His corpse was interred at Leith by his own direction, as desiring to rest with that people on whom he had taken great pains in his life[2]." He was succeeded by Patrick Lindsay, the minister of St. Vigians, near Arbroath, and who was consecrated by archbishop Gladstanes at Leith, on the 1st day of December, to the bishopric of Ross[3].

On the 15th of September, James Stewart, "called of Jerusalem," for hearing mass, and Mr. Robert Phillips, a priest, for celebrating it, were sentenced to lose their heads[4].

1614.—On the 21st January, James Melville, nephew of the founder of Scottish presbytery, died at Berwick, to which place he was confined by the king's order, "where he made a happy and blessed end[5]." He was a man of a milder and more gentle disposition than his uncle; nevertheless he so far copied his

[1] Balfour's Annals, ii. 45, 46. [2] Spottiswood, b. vii. 520.
[3] Keith's Catalogue of the Scottish Bishops.
[4] Balfour's Annals, ii. 42. [5] Calderwood, 648.

coarse manners as to speak great swelling words of vanity, and be a mighty troubler of the church, presumptuous, self-willed, and by no means afraid to speak evil of dignities.

On the 4th of March, the clergy were commanded by proclamation, and the sound of trumpet, at the cross of Edinburgh, to prepare to celebrate the Lord's supper on Easter-day, which fell upon the 24th of April; and the people were charged at the same time to communicate in their parish churches, and Calderwood admits that "*the most part obeyed:* howbeit," he adds, "there were acts of the General Assembly standing in force against it[1]."

Although king James had succeeded to a great extent in subduing the turbulent presbyterians, yet he was now assailed by enemies of a different sort, more powerful, and more insidious. In October, John Oglevie, a jesuit from the college of Gratz in Hungary, was apprehended in Glasgow. He came, he said, "by command of his superiors, to do some service in these parts." There were found on him books containing directions for receiving confessions; a warrant to dispense with them that possessed any church livings; some relics, and a tuft of Loyola's hair, which he held in high veneration. He had seduced a number of young people of the better class, and had repeatedly celebrated mass in Glasgow. And, in November, the archbishop of St. Andrews, and his son, Mr. Alexander Gladstanes, apprehended one Moffat, a mass priest at St. Andrews, who was examined by the privy council on the 10th December, and committed to the castle of Edinburgh.

A commission was given the lord Kilsyth, the deputy treasurer, and the lord advocate, for the examination and trial of Oglevie. Being asked, when he arrived in Scotland what was his business; and where he had chiefly resorted, he replied, that he came in the preceding June, that his errand was to save souls; but he declined to answer the last query lest he might prejudice others. Neither by threats nor persuasions could he be induced to discover those whom he had deceived. According to the barbarous custom of the age, they kept him some nights from sleeping, in order to extort a confession, which had the effect of causing him to make some discoveries, all of which he afterwards denied. The commissioners applied to his majesty to be allowed to put him to torture; but he strictly inhibited this barbarous usage, and answered, "That he would not have these forms used with men of his profession; and if nothing could be found but that he was a jesuit, and had said mass, they should banish him the country, and inhibit him to return without license, under pain of death.

But if it should appear that he had been a practiser for the stirring up of subjects to rebellion, or did maintain the pope's transcendant power over kings, and refused to take the oath of allegiance, they should leave him to the course of law and justice; meanwhile his pleasure was, that the questions following should be moved unto him, and his answers thereto required:—

"1st, Whether the pope be judge, and hath power *in spiritualibus*, over his majesty; and whether that power will reach over his majesty *in temporalibus*, if it be *in ordine ad spiritualia*, as Bellarmine affirmeth? 2d, Whether the pope hath power to excommunicate kings, especially such as are not of his church, as his majesty? 3d, Whether the pope hath power to depose kings by him excommunicated; and, in particular, whether he hath power to depose the king's majesty? 4th, Whether it be not murder to slay the king's majesty, being so excommunicated and deposed by the pope? 5th, Whether the pope hath power to absolve subjects from the oath of their born and native allegiance to his majesty?"

These questions were enclosed in a letter from the king to the archbishop of Glasgow, who assumed the provost of Glasgow as his assessor, whom, Calderwood informs us, with the bailies, "were the king's judges in that part[1]." The principal of the college, and one of the ministers, as witnesses, "did, in their hearing, read the questions, and receive his answers, which he gave under his hand as followeth[2]:"—

"I acknowledge the pope of Rome to be judge unto his majesty, and to have power over him *in spiritualibus*, and over *all* christian kings; but where it is asked, whether that power will reach over him *in temporalibus*, I am not obliged to declare my opinion therein, except to him that is a judge in controversies, viz. the pope, or one having authority from him. 2d, I think the pope hath power to excommunicate the king; and where it is said the king is not of the pope's church, I answer, that all who are baptized are under the pope's power[3]. 3d, If the pope hath power to depose the king, being excommunicate, I answer, that I am not bound to declare my mind,

[1] Page 619.

[2] Spottiswood, b. vii. 522.

[3] Vide Den's Theology, vol. ii. 114, 289.—"Heretics, and all similar persons who have been baptized, are bound by the laws of the church which concern them; nor are they more released from her laws than subjects, rebelling against their lawful prince, are released from the laws of that prince; . . . . . for by baptism they are made subject to the church [of Rome], and they remain personally subject to the church wherever they are."

except to him that is the judge in controversies of religion. To the 4th and 5th I answer *ut supra*."

The archbishop reasoned long with him, and explained the danger in which he placed himself by persisting in these answers, and he was allowed a few days to reflect; but as he was inexorable, his replies were sent to the king, subscribed by himself. The king then gave commission to the provost and bailies of Glasgow to bring him to trial. They were assisted by the marquis of Hamilton, the earl of Lothian, the lords Sanquhar, Fleming, and Boyd. Some days previous to his arraignment he was officially informed "that he was not to be charged with saying of mass, nor any thing that concerned his profession, but only with the answers made to the questions proposed; which, if he should recal, there being yet place for repentance, the trial should be suspended till his majesty was of new advertised." To this he replied, "that he did so little mind to recal any thing he had spoken, as when he should be brought to his answer he should put a bonnet on it."

The trial then came on before the provost and those above named, and he was arraigned for high treason, in compassing and imagining the king's death. When it was demanded if he adhered to the answers which he had given in his examination before the archbishop, and which he had subscribed, he said, "Under protestation that I do no way acknowledge this judgment, nor receive you that are named in that commission for my judges, I deny every point that is laid against me to be treason; for if it were treason, it would be such in all places and in all kingdoms, which you know not to be so. As to your acts of parliament, they were made by a number of partial men, and of matters not subject to their forum or judicatory, for which I will not give a rotten fig. And when I am said to be an enemy to the king's authority, I know not what authority he hath but what he received from his predecessors, who acknowledged the pope of Rome his jurisdiction. If the king will be to me as his predecessors were to mine, I will obey and acknowledge him for my king; but if he do otherwise, and play the runagate from God, as he and you all do, I will not acknowledge him more than this old hat." He was here interrupted, and desired to speak with reverence of his majesty. He said, "He should take the advertisement, and not offend; but the judgment he would not acknowledge. And for the reverence I do you, to stand uncovered, I let you know it is *ad redemptionem vexationis*, and not *ad agnitionem judicii*."

He had permission to challenge any of the jury to whom he

might take exceptions; but he said "he excepted to them all, as either enemies or friends; if the former, they could not sit on his trial; and if the latter, they ought to assist him at the bar. . . . . I am a subject as free as the king is a king: I came by commandment of my superior into this kingdom, and if I were even now forth of it, I would return: neither do I repent any thing but that I have not been so busy as I should in that which you call perverting of subjects. I am accused for declining the king's authority, and will do it still in matters of religion, for with such matters he has nothing to do; and this which I say the *best of your ministers do maintain;* and if they be wise, they will continue of the same mind. Some questions were made to me which I refused to answer, because the profferers were not judges in controversies of religion." "But," said archbishop Spottiswood, who was present, "I hope you will not make this a controversy of religion, whether the king, being deposed by the pope, may be lawfully killed?" He replied, "It is a question among the doctors of the church: many hold the affirmative, not improbably; but as that point is not yet determined, so if it shall be concluded, I will give my life in defence of it; and so to call it unlawful I will not, though I should save my life by saying it."

The freedom of speech which was allowed him made him the more audacious; and the jurors having withdrawn, they unanimously found him guilty of all the treasonable crimes contained in the indictment, which was declared by sir George Elphinstone their chancellor. The provost then pronounced his doom; and he was hanged at the cross of Glasgow on the same afternoon. He was a well-instructed and an obedient enthusiast in the doctrines of Loyola, and would have reduced his opinions to practice had he found an opportunity; for in lamenting his approaching fate to a supposed friend, he said, "that nothing grieved him so much as that he should be apprehended in that time; for if he had lived until Whitsunday at liberty, he should have done that which all the bishops and ministers in Scotland and England should never have helped; and to have done it he would willingly have been drawn in pieces with horses, and not cared what torment he had endured[1]."

In many remarkable instances, the sincerer sort, or, as he called them, "the best of their ministers," had committed similar acts of treason; but with this remarkable difference, that they had always escaped with banishment. This trial, however,

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. pp. 521-523.

showed the exact coincidence of their doctrines in the matter of claiming a supremacy, both in spirituals and temporals, over the crown. These positions have been since illustrated by the celebrated Peter Dens, who says, "the pope has plenitude of power; so that his power extends itself to all who are in the church, and to all things which regard the government of the church; . . . . . because the power of binding, which belongs to a compulsory power, is given to Peter and his successors. Perpetual custom also confirms this. Hence the power of suspending, excommunicating, &c. exists in the pope[1]." Moffat had less of the enthusiast, or, as the jesuits would say, of the spirit of martyrdom in him; for he not only suppressed all the sentiments in which Oglevie had gloried, but even condemned them. He was therefore suffered to depart out of the country, "the king professing, as he ever did, that he would never hang a priest for his religion; only those polygrammatic papists that were set upon sedition, and to move disturbances in countries, he could not away with." Calderwood agrees substantially with the archbishop in his account of Oglevie's trial; but adds, "yet he [Oglevie] had small courage when he came to the scaffold, where he died heartless and comfortless, and would not commend himself to God at the minister's desire, till the hangman desired him[2]."

1615.—On the 2d of May archbishop Gladstanes died in the Castle of St. Andrews, and was interred on the 7th of June in the south-east aisle of the parish church. Dr. Cowper, bishop of Galloway, preached the funeral sermon, which, with his usual candour, Calderwood says, was "full of vile flattery and lies, for which he was derided by the people." He also adds, "at the desire of his wife and children, he [the archbishop] subscribed some few lines, wherein he approved of the present course to procure to them the king's favour. We have heard of his strange disease and senseless end in general; but I have not learned, certainly, the particulars[3]." But a better and more charitable judge says of him, "he was a man of good learning, ready utterance, and great invention; but of an easy nature, and induced by those he trusted to do many things hurtful to the see, especially in leasing the titles of his benefice for many ages to come, esteeming that by this means he should purchase the love and friendship of men, whereas there is no sure friendship but that which is joined with respect; and to the preserving of this nothing conduceth more than a

[1] Dens' Theology, v. ii. p. 155. [2] Calderwood, 649.—Spottiswood, 523.
[3] Calderwood, p. 650.

wise and prudent administration of the church's rents wherewith they are entrusted. He left behind him, in writing, a declaration of his judgment touching matters then controverted in the church, professing 'that he had accepted the episcopal function upon good warrant, and that his conscience did never accuse him for any thing done that way.' This he did to obviate the rumours which he foresaw would be dispersed after his death, either of his recantation, or of some trouble of spirit that he was cast into (for these are the usual practices of the puritan sect); whereas he ended his days most piously, and to the great comfort of all the beholders[1]."

On the demise of Gladstanes, Dr. Spottiswood, archbishop of Glasgow, was translated to St. Andrews. James Law, bishop of Orkney, was translated to the see of Glasgow; George Graham, of faithless memory, was translated from Dunblane to Orkney; and Adam Bellenden, rector of Falkirk, was consecrated at St. Andrews to the see of Dunblane[2]. Spottiswood was unwilling to leave Glasgow, but the king was resolved that, as he had all along been his chief minister for ecclesiastical affairs, he should be primate and metropolitan of the kingdom. On the 3d of August he made his public entry into St. Andrews, accompanied by a large company of the nobility and gentry; on the 5th he preached in the forenoon, and the following day, being Sunday, he was inaugurated, and the bishop of Galloway preached[3]. On Tuesday, the 8th of August, he held a court of high commission upon John Malcom, one of the ministers of Perth, "a grave, godly, and learned man," for offensive remarks in a publication respecting the ecclesiastical changes which had taken place. He brought a number of his parishioners with him to overawe the court; but the time for that mode of proceeding had passed away. He explained his meaning in writing, which he subscribed at the desire of the court, and his explanation was transmitted to the king, who was satisfied. Upon the 26th November, the archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow took the oaths of allegiance, and did homage for their temporalities in the Chapel Royal at Edinburgh, before the lord high commissioner and the privy council. On the 21st December, the courts of high commission for the two provinces of St. Andrews and Glasgow were united into one court, by a royal ordinance signed by the chancellor and other three ministers of state[4].

1616.—The absolution of the marquis of Huntly by Abbot,

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. 523.
[2] Keith's Catalogue of Scottish Bishops.
[3] Calderwood, 650.
[4] Calderwood, pp. 650-654.

archbishop of Canterbury, although sanctioned by the bishop of Caithness, who happened to be then in London, had nearly occasioned a dispute between the two churches, but which was happily prevented by letters of apology or explanation from the king and the archbishop of Canterbury, addressed to the archbishop of St. Andrews, and which appeased the rising indignation of the Scottish clergy.

About eight years previously, the *titular* church had excommunicated the marquis of Huntly, for his adhesion to the papal communion, and he had been able to protect himself from the civil consequences by living in his fastnesses and among his military tenantry in the north. He had also made simulated promises of reconcilement; but he now began to shew what was called "open insolencie," by directing his officers to forbid his tenants to attend the established church. For this he was cited before the court of high commission, and committed to the castle. In the course of a day or two the lord chancellor set him at liberty on his own warrant; for which some of the bishops then in town remonstrated with him. He "answered disdainfully, 'that he might enlarge, without their advice, any that were imprisoned by the high commission;' and when it was told that the church would take this ill, he said, 'that he cared not what their church thought of him.'" The clergy made great complaints from their pulpits of this wanton insult on the chief ecclesiastical court; and the bishops represented the case to the king as a direct usurpation, and sent the bishop of Caithness to court, to support their remonstrance. On the other hand, the chancellor complained of the liberties the clergy took, out of whom some of the old leven had not yet been purged, of exclaiming against and censuring the actions of his majesty's ministers, in their sermons.

Before his imprisonment, the marquis of Huntly had obtained license to come up to court, and as soon as he was discharged from the castle he began his journey. On hearing the bishop of Caithness's complaint, James sent the under secretary, Mr. Patrick Hamilton, to meet him, and command him to return, and enter into ward again in the castle. Hamilton was also the bearer of a letter to the council, sharply rebuking them for releasing the marquis, in contempt of the court of high commission. The parties met at Huntingdon, and being within a day's journey of London, the marquis persuaded Hamilton to return, and shew the king that he had come up with the intention of giving his majesty full satisfaction in all points, and to entreat permission to appear at court. The king was pleased

with his offer to make satisfaction, and he licensed the marquis to come forward, but directed him to go to the archbishop of Canterbury, with whom his lordship had offered to communicate. But it being contrary to the canons and the general practice of the Catholic church, that a man who had been excommunicated by one particular church should, without that church's consent, be absolved by another particular church, it was a matter of doubt and grave consultation what course to pursue. The king was anxious to win over the marquis, and "to strike the iron whilst it was hot," that "this bruised reed should not be broken," although unwilling to infringe on the order of the church; yet he thought the bishop of Caithness's presence and consent would be a sufficient warrant.

Upon the consent of the bishop of Caithness, the archbishop of Canterbury absolved the old marquis, and he was admitted to the communion the same day, in the chapel at Lambeth, upon the 8th of July. The news of this created a considerable sensation in Scotland, and was considered as a practical revival of the old claim of supremacy which the archbishops of York had formerly set up, but which had been always nobly resisted. On the 12th of July, archbishop Spottiswood noticed it in his sermon, in St. Giles's, and said that the king had provided that the like should not fall out hereafter[1]. Archbishop Spottiswood wrote a long letter of remonstrance to the king, who condescended to apologise and explain, among other things, that "all that was done was with a due acknowledgment and reservation of the power and independent authority of the church of Scotland;"—"that the absolution given him in England did necessarily *imply* an acknowledgment of the church of Scotland; whereas, if the archbishop of Canterbury had received him to the holy communion, and not first absolved him, being excommunicated by the church of Scotland, the contempt and neglect had been a great deal greater." Still farther to allay the justly aroused indignation of the Scottish church, the archbishop of Canterbury wrote to the archbishop of St. Andrews by the king's desire, and, as he said, "that the archbishop's letter, written to that effect, should be put upon record, *and kept as a perpetual monument for ages to come*[2]."

These letters having been communicated to the clergy and others, gave them great satisfaction; and as the king of blessed memory commanded it to be recorded *ad futuram rei memoriam*, and archbishop Spottiswood "thought it meet to be in-

[1] Calderwood, p. 655. [2] Spottiswood, b. vii. 525-528.

serted in his history," I here give archbishop Abbot's letter without abridgment[1].

Nevertheless it was resolved, in order to satisfy the whole body of the clergy, that the marquis, on his return from court, should present a supplication to the General Assembly, at its convocation at Aberdeen, acknowledging his offence, promising to continue in the profession of the truth, and to educate his children therein. On these conditions he should be again ab-

[1] *Salutem in Christo.*

Because I understand that a General Assembly is shortly to be held at Aberdeen, I cannot but esteem it an office of brotherly love to yield you an account of that great action which lately befel us here with the marquis of Huntly. So it was then, that upon the coming up of the said marquis, his majesty sharply intreating him for not giving satisfaction to the church of Scotland, and for a time restraining him from his royal presence, the marquis resolving to give his majesty contentment, did voluntarily proffer to communicate when and wheresoever his highness should be pleased to make known that offer to me; it was held fit to strike the iron whilst it was hot, and that this great work should be accomplished before his majesty's going to progress; whereunto a good opportunity was offered by the consecration of the bishop of Chester, which was to be in my chappel of Lambeth, the 7th of this month, at which time a solemn communion was then to be celebrated.

The only pause was, that the marquis being excommunicated by the church of Scotland, there was in appearance some difficulty how he might be absolved in the church of England; wherewith his majesty being acquainted, who wished that it should not be deferred, we agreed to this peaceable resolution, which I doubt not your lordship and the rest of our brethren there will interpret to the best. For, 1st, what was to be performed might be adventured upon, as we esteemed, out of a brotherly correspondency and unity of affection, and not only [*qu.* out of] of any authority; for we all know that as the kingdom of Scotland is a free and absolute monarchy, so the church of Scotland is entire in itself, and independent upon any other church. 2dly, we find, by the advice of divers doctors of the civil law, and men best experienced in things of this nature, that the course of ecclesiastical proceedings would fairly permit that we might receive to our communion a man excommunicated in another church, if the said person do declare that he had a purpose hereafter for some time to reside among us, which the lord marquis did openly profess that he intended, and I know his majesty doth desire it; and, for my part, I rest satisfied that it can bring no prejudice, but rather contentment, unto you and to that kingdom. 3dly, it pleased God, the night before the celebration of the sacrament, to send in our brother the bishop of Caithness, with whom I taking counsel, his lordship resolved me, that it was my best way to absolve the lord marquis, and assured me that it would be well taken by the bishops and pastors of the church of Scotland. I leave the report of this to my lord Caithness himself, who was an eye-witness with what reverence the marquis did participate of that holy sacrament. For all other circumstances, I doubt not but you shall be certified of them from his majesty, whose gracious and princely desire is, that this bruised reed should not be broken, but that so great a personage (whose example may do much good) should be cherished and comforted in his coming forward to God: which I for my part do hope and firmly believe that you all will endeavour, according to the wisdom and prudence which Almighty God hath given you. And thus, as your lordship hath ever been desirous that I should give you the best assistance I could with his majesty for the reducing or restraining this nobleman, so you see I have done it with the best discretion I could; which I doubt not but all our brethren with you will take as proceeding from my desire to serve God and his majesty, and the whole church of

solved, according to the form used in the Scottish church; which was accordingly done with great pomp. By this means James was relieved from the difficulties with which Huntly's absolution in England had encompassed him. The king entertained the warmest friendship for the marquis of Huntly, on whom he had bestowed the daughter of his dearest favourite the duke of Lennox. He detained his eldest son at court, and took great pains to educate him in the protestant religion.

In the beginning of July, Peter Blackburn, bishop of Aberdeen, died; "a man of good parts, but, whilst he studied to

Scotland. I send you herewith the form which I used in absolving the lord marquis in the presence of the lord primate of Ireland, the lord bishop of London, and divers others. And so, beseeching the blessing of God upon you all, that in your Assembly with unity of spirit you may proceed to the honour of Christ and to the beating down of antichrist and popery, I leave you to the Almighty.

From my house at Croydon, July 23, 1616.

The form of absolution used by archbishop Abbott.

Whereas the purpose and intendment of the whole church of Christ is to win men unto God, and frame their souls for heaven, and that there is such an agreement and corresponding betwixt the churches of Scotland and England, that what the bishops and pastors in the one, without any earthly or worldly respect, will accomplish to satisfy the christian and charitable end and desire of the other, cannot be distasteful to either; I, therefore, finding your earnest entreaty to be loosed from the bond of excommunication wherewith you stand bound in the church of Scotland, and well considering the reason and cause of that censure, as also considering your desire, on this present day, to communicate here with us, for the better effecting of this work of participation of the holy sacrament of Christ our Saviour, his blessed body and blood, do absolve you from the said excommunication, in the name of God the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and beseech the Almighty God, that you may be so directed by the Holy Spirit, that you may continue in the truth of his gospel unto your life's end, and then be made partaker of his everlasting kingdom."

I beg leave here to introduce a note from Mr. Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 257:—"In considering the Marquis of Huntly's conduct, it appears somewhat strange that he should have scrupled to communicate with the church of Scotland even under the late regular settlement upon the English plan, and yet, on his first appearance in London, should have agreed so readily to join in communion with the church there. This will no doubt be imputed to inconsistency and a time-serving disposition; but there is a passage in the king's letter which may be made use of to account for it in another way. Among other arguments, the king desires the church of Scotland to consider, that though the marquis had sworn and subscribed all the other articles of religion, and had frequently heard sermon, yet 'his absolution at home was deferred upon the scruple he made about the presence of our Saviour in the sacrament.' From this it would appear, that the doctrine of the eucharist in the church of England, where he had no scruples about the presence of Christ in it, was at that time different from the doctrine of the church of Scotland, which kept him back from partaking of it with them. And if this was the case with this nobleman, as we have the king's word it was, it shows that he had all along been more honest and conscientious, on a point of so high importance, than many of his prosecutors had been willing to believe, or perhaps capable to perceive."

please the opposers of the episcopal state, he made himself ungracious to both, and so lost his authority." Calderwood says, he died "after he had lien a long time little better than benumbed;" and he adds, with his usual malignity, "he was more careful of a purse, with five hundred merks in it, which he keeped in his bosom, than of any thing else[1]." Mr. Alexander Forbes, rector of Fettercairn, and bishop of Caithness, "a man well-born and of good inclination, was, after bishop Blackburn, formally elected by the chapter, and translated to this see, but he lived not much above a year[2]." According to Keith's Catalogue, it does not appear that a successor in the see of Caithness was elected till the year 1624, nine years after bishop Forbes's translation, when John Abernethy, rector of Jedburgh, was preferred to the see of Caithness, he nevertheless still retaining his rectory of Jedburgh.

A General Assembly met at Aberdeen on the 13th of August, in which the earl of Montrose sat as the royal commissioner; and on which day a fast was proclaimed to be kept by proclamation and sound of trumpet. Patrick Forbes, of Corse, rector of Keith, and afterwards bishop of Aberdeen, preached in the morning; the archbishop of St. Andrews in the afternoon; and Mr. William Forbes in the evening. Secretary Hamilton and the lord Carnegie were appointed by the king assessors to the high commissioner; and the archbishop assumed the chair as moderator, in right of his rank as primate and metropolitan of the kingdom.

The clergy were now beginning to experience the advantage of order and regular government, since the spiritual fathers of the church had acquired their legitimate authority, and really possessed that spiritual power to which they had only pretended before. The Melvilles, and some other dissentients, having been removed, the broils and animosities which formerly disgraced the church had now almost entirely disappeared. Accordingly, in this Assembly it was enacted, that a Liturgy, or Book of Common Prayer, should be compiled for the use of the church of Scotland; and to this intent a committee was appointed to revise the Old, or Knox's, Book of Common Prayer, contained in the Psalm Book; that the acts of the General Assembly should be collected, and put in form, to serve as canons for the church in their ministration of discipline; that children should be carefully catechised and confirmed by the bishops; that grammar-schools should be kept in all parishes; and that a register should be kept of all

[1] Calderwood, p. 655. [2] Keith's Catalogue, 131.

baptisms, marriages, and burials, by every parish minister[1]. The archbishop of Glasgow and the bishop of Ross were then deputed by the Assembly to present these acts to his majesty, and to solicit his royal confirmation. The king agreed to all the acts of this Assembly—only, he objected to the act for the confirmation of young children "as a mere hotch-potch," he said, not so clear as requisite, and therefore he directed it to be reformed. The king required that the following articles should be inserted among the canons:—

That the holy communion should be administered to the people kneeling; that it should be administered to the sick or dying at home; that, in cases of necessity, baptism should be administered in private houses; that the commemoration of the birth, passion, resurrection, and ascension of our blessed Saviour, and the sending down of the Holy Ghost, should be annually observed at their appointed seasons; and that children should be catechised, and taught the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Ten Commandments, and be afterwards confirmed by the bishop[2].

Had such articles been proposed to have been introduced in this manner in the days of the holy discipline, the sincerer sort would have "roused their army—the people," to resist such a stretch of the prerogative with all the energy of popular indignation and tumult; but, in the present case, the archbishop did it more effectually, and within the limits of his own place. He wrote a letter to the king, in which he represented the irregularity of this course, and the impossibility of complying with his majesty's request, because the articles had not been formally proposed to the church, nor discussed in a General Assembly; and that consequently they could not be inserted in the canons of the church of Scotland without the consent of the whole of that church. The king thought proper to agree to this postponement of his favourite measure, and did not for the present press it any farther, thinking that he should be able to obtain the church's consent when he came in person into Scotland in the following year.

Several acts were made in this Assembly for counteracting the insidious devices of the jesuits, who, under various pretences, still lurked in the kingdom, and taught their pernicious principles to children who attended schools taught by women. The king's and the archbishop of Canterbury's letters were read, and ordered to be registered in the acts of the General

[1] Calderwood, 663.—Spottiswood, 528.
[2] Spottiswood, 529.

Assembly; and the marquis of Huntly appearing on the 2d August, declared his sorrow for having so long lain under the censures of the church, made oath that he would truly conform to the established church, and subscribed the confession of faith. "The Assembly ordained the noble lord to be absolved from the sentence of excommunication, led and deduced against him before: conform whereto, the right reverend father, John, archbishop of St. Andrews, moderator, in face of the whole Assembly, absolved the said noble lord, George, marquis of Huntly, from the sentence of excommunication, led and deduced against him, and received him into the bosom of the kirk[1]."

On the 16th December, Marke Antonius de Dominis, archbishop of Spalato, or Spalatro, in the Venetian states, arrived at Lambeth, where he was very honourably received by the archbishop of Canterbury. He was appointed dean of Windsor, and master of the Savoy. He remained in England for some time, and wrote a brief declaration of his reasons for leaving the church of Rome, in his *Consilium Profectionis*, and which was published in eight different languages[2]. His principal reason was the usurped supremacy of the pope over his brethren the bishops of his communion; and therefore he came to England in search of a purer and more primitive episcopacy. But he experienced that, even there, the church was in bondage and servitude to the state, and suffered under a regal supremacy nearly as intolerable as the papal. Disgusted with this discovery he returned to his native country; and, being invited to sojourn at Rome, he experienced the tender mercies of the Inquisition, and was never more heard of.

1617.—About the end of January, the king acquainted the Scottish privy council by letter with his intention to visit his native kingdom: his motives, he said, "were a salmon-like instinct, affection, and earnest longing and desire to see the place of his breeding, and an anxious desire to discharge some points of his kingly office, so far forth as he might commodiously, not offending his good subjects, both of the ecclesiastical and civil estate."

Portraits of the twelve apostles were sent down from London to ornament the chapel-royal, which excited the popular indignation to great fury. It was alleged, that images were setting up for worship, and that the next step would be to celebrate

[1] Calderwood, p. 665.
[2] Case of the Regale, ed. 1702, p. 146-47.—Balfour's Annals, ii. 63, 64.

mass. The bishops, willing to allay the uproar, and remove the cause of offence, petitioned his majesty to order the removal of the paintings, in compliance with the popular prejudice, which, though very unwillingly, James consented to do; "but yet, with a sharp rebuke and check of ignorance, both from his majesty and Canterbury[1], calling our scarring at them *scandalum acceptum, sed non datum.* We bear the reproof the more patiently, because we have obtained that which we craved[2]." On the 13th of May, James was met by the privy council at Berwick, by whose advice he prorogued the parliament, which had been summoned for the 17th of May, to the 13th of June. The king was welcomed to "the place of his breeding" with the most extravagant joy and the warmest affection.

At the appointed day (Tuesday, the 17th June) parliament met, and the king opened its sittings with a long speech, in which, among other things, he recommended "the establishing religion and justice, neither of which, he said, could be looked for, so long as a regard was not had for the ministers of both. Notwithstanding the long profession of the truth, numbers of [parish] churches *still remained unplanted;* and of those that were planted, few or none had any competent maintenance: for this he wished some course to be taken, and certain commissioners to be chosen for appointing to every church a perpetual local stipend, such as should suffice to maintain a minister, and make him able to attend on his charge of justice." James experienced considerable opposition in choosing the Lords of the Articles. The nobility had become jealous of the rise and aggrandisement of the bishops, and, as most of them had contrived to appropriate some of the church lands, they were apprehensive that, if the bishops' power increased, they would in time recover the rich estates of which their sees had been stripped at the reformation. Whoever the king recommended as fit persons were rejected and set aside, and others less affected towards his majesty's service chosen; and it was not without great opposition that the ministers of state were admitted. Among the articles proposed, was one concerning his majesty's authority in causes ecclesiastical, declaring, "that whatever should be determined by the king, with the advice of the archbishops and bishops, in matters of external policy,

[1] Dr. George Abbot was at that time archbishop of Canterbury.

[2] Letter from the bishop of Galloway to Rev. Patrick Simpson, of Stirling March 26, 1617, cited in Calderwood, p. 671.

the same should have the power and strength of an ecclesiastical law." The bishops opposed this, and humbly entreated that the act might be reconsidered, for in making ecclesiastical laws the advice and consent of the presbyters were also required. To this the king replied, "that he did not object to the ministers giving their advice, or that a competent number of the most grave and learned amongst them should be called to assist the bishop; but to have matters ruled as they have hitherto been in the General Assemblies, I will never agree; for the bishops must rule the ministers, and the king rule both in matters indifferent, and not repugnant to the word of God." Subsequently, the bill passed the Lords of the Articles, in the following form—"That whatsoever his majesty should determine in the external government of the church, with the advice of the archbishops, bishops, and a competent number of the ministry, should have the strength of a law[1]."

This article threw the sincerer sort into the most dreadful consternation; as if the whole rites and ceremonies of the church of England were to have been thrust on the nation at once, and without their consent. The prudent government of the bishops had preserved such a calm in the ecclesiastical atmosphere, that a hurricane was absolutely necessary to maintain the zeal and obstinacy of the presbyterian brethren, who still retained their livings, notwithstanding the real episcopacy which had been established. Accordingly, one Struthers introduced into his sermon a violent outpouring of his wrath on the church of England, in which he condemned her rites and ceremonies, and prayed that Scotland might be spared from the like. Not content with raving in their sermons against the supposed dangers, about fifty of the discontented ministers assembled, and composed a protest against the obnoxious article. These men could not have been ignorant that the bishops had expressly provided that the ministers should vote in all ecclesiastical matters, and had preserved for them all the liberty which they formerly enjoyed in their General Assemblies, of giving their advice in the making of laws. The restoration of episcopacy had prevented them from exercising that licentious turbulence which had formerly characterised and disgraced their meetings. The protest was conveyed to James before the time of passing the acts; and he accordingly directed the lord-register to lay aside that article, and not to present it for ratification, which was done there by touching with the sceptre, "as

[1] Calderwood, 675.—Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 531.

a thing (he said) no way necessary, the prerogative of the crown bearing him to more than was declared by it . . . . . Thereafter, the king, in a most gracious speech, having commanded the execution of the laws made, to the judges and other inferior magistrates, gave the estates a most kind and loving farewell[1]." So far, says Mr. Skinner[2], "were the bishops, we see by these two instances, from humouring or flattering the king in all his proposals, as a few malignants falsely upbraided them; and so cautious were they in this last instance not to stretch the prerogative inherent in their character to too great a height above their brethren of the lower clergy. For however willing they might be, for the sake of peace, to admit their presbyters to some share of legislative power, they could not but know that in the primitive and uncorrupted ages this was *neither demanded nor practised* . . . . . Whether the condescension of our bishops at this time, in thus parcelling out their legislative authority among their inferiors, answered any good end now, or produced any good effect afterwards, is a question to be determined by events, not by arguments; and they themselves soon saw the disagreeable consequences of what they had done. For the article thus modified was taken hold of by a few malcontents among the ministers to raise a clamour as if the whole fabric of the church was to be demolished at once. And to such a height did they carry their inconsiderate zeal, that while the parliament was sitting they drew up a protestation against passing the article into a law, pleading the purity of their reformation, the liberty and tranquillity of the church, and the many royal assurances given them that no innovation or alteration should be imposed upon them without the previous concurrence of the whole clergy convened in a General Assembly of the church."

On the dissolution of parliament, Simpson and Ewart, two ministers who in name of the others had subscribed the protest, and Calderwood, the historian, who was supposed to have written it, were summoned to St. Andrews, and convicted of sedition by the Court of High Commission. The former were imprisoned and suspended from their ministry, and the latter was condemned to perpetual exile. Calderwood was imprisoned for some time, and afterwards went to Holland, the grand emporium at that time of all the plots and conspiracies both against the church and the state[3].

[1] Spottiswood, b. xii. p. 533.
[2] Spottiswood.
[3] Ecclesiastical History, v. ii. p. 262.
[3] Calderwood, 674—675.

James used many arguments to persuade the bishops to adopt an exact conformity with their mother church of England. After his arrival, he had, as an example, directed the holy communion to be administered to his own household, kneeling; and the whole privy council, with many of the nobility, received the same in that humble and devout attitude. Calderwood denounces the kneeling posture as a disregard of Christ's institution and the order of our kirk; and he says, the bishop of Galloway at first refused, but after consideration complied. "The ministers," he says, "of Edinburgh, in the meantime were silent, neither dissuading the king in private, nor opening their mouth in public against this innovation, or *bad example;*" which may be received as a fair acknowledgment that they consented and approved of this ancient, catholic, and most becoming gesture of reverence and humility. James also had introduced an organ into the chapel royal; and, says the same unwilling witness, "upon Saturday the 17th of May, the English service, singing of quiristers and playing on organs, and surplices, were first heard and seen in the chapel royal[1]." The English Liturgy was henceforward read as the daily service in it, up to the period of the riots in king Charles's time; and it is a curious fact, that the chapel royal was at that time the parish church of the Canongate, whose inhabitants must have become familiarised with the Liturgy long before its legal introduction.

The king appointed the bishops, and about thirty-six of the inferior clergy, to meet at St. Andrews on the 10th of July, that he might communicate his sentiments previous to his final farewell, on his return to "the land of promise." They met in the chapel of the castle, and the king addressed them as follows:—"What and how great my care hath been for this church, as well before as since my going into England, is so well known to you all, as I neither need, nor do I mean to speak much of it, lest any think I am seeking thanks for that I have done. It sufficeth me, that God knoweth my intention is, and ever was, to have his true worship maintained, and a decent and comely order established in the church. But of you I must complain, and of your causeless jealousies, even when my meaning towards you is best. Before my coming home to visit this kingdom, being advertised that in your last Assembly an act was made for gathering the acts of the church, and putting them in form, I desired a few articles to be inserted; one was for the annual commemoration of the

[1] Calderwood, p. 674. [2] Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 534.

greatest blessings bestowed by our Saviour on mankind, as his nativity, passion, resurrection, ascension, and the descent of the Holy Spirit; another for the private use of both sacraments on urgent and necessary occasions; a third for the reverent administration of his holy supper; and a fourth for catechising and confirming young children by the bishops. It was answered, that these particulars had not been moved in any of the church Assemblies, and so could not be inserted among the rest, which excuse I admitted, and was not minded to press them any more, till you, after advice, did give consent thereto; yet, when in the late parliament I desired my prerogative to be declared in the making of the ecclesiastical laws, certain of your number did mutinously assemble themselves, and form a protestation to cross my just desires. But I will pass that among many other wrongs I have received at your hands. The errand for which I have now called you, is, to hear what your scruples are in these points, and the reasons, if any you can have, why the same ought not to be admitted. I mean not to do any thing against reason; and on the other part, my demands being just and religious, you must not think that I will be refused or resisted. It is a power innate, and a special prerogative which we that are christian kings have, to order and dispose of external things in the policy of the church, as we, by the advice of our bishops, shall find most fitting; and for your approving or disapproving, deceive not yourselves, I will never regard it, unless you bring me a reason which I cannot answer[1]."

The clergy desired that his majesty might esteem them humble and obedient subjects, and requested permission to withdraw for consultation, which being allowed, they adjourned to the parish church, where they agreed that a General Assembly of the church was the most proper place to decide on the king's proposals, where they would have the advantage of free discussion, and, if agreed to, they would be better received, and esteemed more authoritative, than if consented to by those present. Accordingly, they petitioned the king to convoke a full and free General Assembly, when they promised these articles should be proposed for adoption. The king having formerly had experience of the refractory materials of which General Assemblies were composed, strongly objected to summon a convocation; for, said he, if the Assembly should reject the articles, his difficulty would be greater, "and when I shall use my authority in establishing them, they shall call me tyrant

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 533-534.

and persecutor." They all protested that no man would be so mad as to say so: "yet," said the king, "experience tells me it may be so; therefore, unless I be made sure, I will not give way to an Assembly." Mr. Patrick Galloway said, that the archbishop of St. Andrews would answer for their peaceable conduct; but the archbishop declined, having been so often previously deceived, and a pregnant instance of their insubordination having occurred during the sitting of parliament. Then, said Mr. Galloway, "If your majesty will trust me, I will assure for the ministers;" and on his assurance that there should be none of those factious democratical cabals which had formerly disgraced their meetings, he consented that an Assembly should be summoned to meet on the 25th November next, at St. Andrews. After this the king returned to England by the way of Dumfries, where the bishop of Galloway preached a farewell sermon, "which made the hearers burst forth in many tears[1]," and where he composed a number of feuds amongst his nobility, and compelled the reconciled parties to "chap hands," in token of their reconciliation[2].

At the time and place the Assembly met, the lord Binning (afterwards earl of Haddington) and the viscount Stormont being the royal commissioners. The archbishop of St. Andrews assumed the place of moderator, and addressed the meeting in a short exhortation, wherein he took a summary view of the affairs of the church since the Reformation; and showed that all its calamities arose from the seditious spirit of its ministers themselves, and earnestly entreated them, for the glory of God, the honour of the gospel, and their own good, to adopt a different course, and to complete the king's good intentions, rather than to court the vain applause of factious individuals. For two days the debates were conducted with calmness and moderation, but a motion having been made for delaying the decision of the king's proposals, the commissioner rose and objected to any procrastination, and intimated his majesty's displeasure, that, after all their promises, nothing should be concluded, but that they still evaded the points before them. They passed an act, however, with many restrictions, for the private administration of the communion to the sick, and for the delivery of the elements in the communion out of the minister's own hands; but the other articles they deferred till another and a more convenient opportunity. Instead of satisfying the king, these two acts only exasperated him, and made him consider them a mockery of his demands. He wrote two

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 534. [2] Balfour's Annals, ii. 68.

remarkably severe letters to the archbishops, and in the postscript of one of them he inserted, with his own hand—"Since your Scottish church has so far contemned my clemency, they shall now know what it is to draw down the anger of a king," and he fulfilled this threat by sending peremptory orders to the privy council to stop the payment of the stipends of those clergy who had shown the greatest opposition to the articles[1].

In his letter to the archbishops, his majesty said—"We have received your letter, and thereby understand what your proceedings have been in that Assembly at St. Andrews, concerning which we will have you know, that we are come to that age as we will not be content to be fed with broth, as one of your coat was wont to speak, and think this your doing a disgrace no less than the protestation itself. Wherefore it is our pleasure, and we command you, as you will avoid our highest displeasure, the one of you, by your deputy in St. Andrews, and by yourself in Edinburgh, and the other of you in Glasgow, to keep Christmas day precisely, yourselves preaching, and choosing your texts according to the time. And likewise that you discharge all modification of stipends for this year to any minister whatsoever, such excepted as have testified their affection to our service at this time by furthering, at their power, the acceptation of the articles proposed: and in the premises willing you not to fail, we bid you farewell.

"Newmarket, 6th Dec. 1617."

This decisive and severe step had the desired effect, and the clergy became supplicants to the archbishop of St. Andrews to preach on Christmas day, and to intercede with his majesty for them. This vigorous measure, for which they were not prepared, immediately cured the clergy of their opposition to the articles; but it is a practical exposition of the danger arising to the liberties of the church through a state-paid stipendiary clergy. The spirit of martyrdom, or of self-denial and of taking up the cross, does not fall upon all men. Although James exercised the power for a good purpose which the sacrilegious madness of the first reformers had placed in his hands by the destruction of the church's independent property, yet it might be abused to a bad, or to any selfish or sectarian purpose, and besides, it threw the whole power into the king's hands, to be executed at his will, or at that of a profligate minister. There was danger also of that secular spirit being fostered in the clergy which the Erastian principles that were

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 535.

engendered by the manner of the Scottish reformation and by the translation of the pontificate to the regality, had begotten. James resorted to this extreme measure because persuasive arguments had no effect with men who had been so corrupted by the presbyterian leaven in which they had so recently wallowed; for he ever desired to be a nursing father to the church, and at the same time to be her most dutiful and obedient son, to protect, love, cherish, reverence, and serve her as the spouse of Christ.

In another letter which his majesty wrote to the archbishop of St. Andrews, he said—"After we had commanded the dispatch of our other letter, we received an extract, concluded (we know not how) in your Assembly, and subscribed by the clerk thereof; the one concerning private communion, and the other concerning the form to be used at the receiving the holy sacrament; both so hedged, and conceived in so ridiculous a manner, as, besides that of the whole articles proponed these two were the least necessary to have been urged and hastened, the scornful condition and form of their grant makes us justly wish that they had been refused with the rest; for in the first, concerning the communion allowed to sick persons, besides a necessity, tying them on oath to declare that they truly think not to recover, but to die of that disease, besides the number required to receive with such patients, they are yet further hedged in with a necessity to receive the sacrament in a convenient room, which what it importeth we cannot guess, seeing no room can be so convenient for a sick man (sworn to die) as his bed; and that it were injurious and inhuman from thence in any case to transport him, were the room never so neat and handsome to which they should carry him.

"And as to that other act, ordaining the minister himself to give the elements in the celebration out of his own hand to every one of the communicants, and that he may perform this the more commodiously, by the advice of the magistrates and other honest men of his session, to prepare a table at which the same may be conveniently ministered; truly, in this we must say that the minister's ease and commodious sitting on his tail has been more looked to than that kneeling which, for reverence, we directly required to be enjoined to the receivers of so divine a sacrament; neither can we perceive what should be meant by that table, unless they mean to make a round table (as did the Jews) to sit and receive at. In conclusion, seeing either we and this church, now, must be held idolatrous in this point of kneeling, or they reputed rebellious knaves in refusing the same, and that the two foresaid acts are

conceived so scornfully, and so far from our meaning; it is our pleasure that the same be *altogether suppressed*, and that no effect follow thereupon. So we bid you farewell.—Newmarket, 11th December, 1617."[1]

The archbishop of St. Andrews preached in St. Giles's on Christmas day, upon the propriety and the primitive custom of observing the great festivals of the church; and the bishop of Galloway in the Chapel Royal; for which, and "playing upon organs," Calderwood gravely asserts, "they ought to have been secluded from voting afterwards in that matter, and *condignly* censured." Archibald Simpson, prisoner in the castle, petitioned the court of high commission to be discharged, and professed the greatest penitence. He was brought before the court and signed his petition, on which easy condition he was restored to his benefice; but in less than a week he published an apology for his submission, which he ascribed to weakness and frailty; "and hoped to be like Peter, *qui ore negavit, et corde confessus est*, and never to betray the Lord's cause with Judas[2]." This, says Spottiswood, "I have remembered, by the way, to make the humours of these men seen, and the small regard they take of saying and gainsaying, when it maketh for their purpose."

On the 14th December, Alexander Forbes, of the family of Armurdo, bishop of Aberdeen, died at Leith. He was a man, saith Keith, of "good inclination;" but Calderwood, delighted to find an opportunity of maligning a bishop, says,—"Fain would he have uttered something to the bishop of St. Andrews, but he being loath to leave his playing at the cards, howbeit it was the Lord's day, the other departed before he came[3]. These breaches of the ninth commandment, although it was only *one* point of the law, yet, as it was their constant and unvarying custom, the presbyterian ministers were thus continually guilty of breaking the whole law; and therefore their evidence is unworthy of implicit belief. Patrick Forbes, of Corse, an immediate descendant of the noble family of Forbes, which broke off from the parent stem in the reign of James III. was unanimously elected to succeed the late bishop in this see, "with the concurrent voice of all ranks, and the recommendation of the king." It was James's laudable custom, that on the death of a bishop he directed the archbishop of the province to convene his fellow bishops, and propose to him three clergymen whom they judged most fit for the episcopal office, out of whom he chose one to be preferred to the vacant

[1] Spottiswood, vii. 535-6. [2] Calderwood, 691. [3] Ib. True Hist. p. 691.

see. Happy would it be for the church of England were this excellent custom to be revived, and it might be done without any infringement of the royal prerogative, and with the greatest possible advantage to the church: or the crown might select three men, and present to the chapter of the vacant diocese, one of whom the chapter should be bound to choose for their bishop.

1618.—On the 29th of January, the bishops met at Edinburgh; and, in a joint letter, entreated his majesty to permit the convocation of another Assembly,—promising that, in the synodal meetings, they would exert themselves to procure obedience to his majesty's desires. The king replied, that he had, on their primate's solicitation, suspended the execution of his last directions for depriving the refractory clergy of their stipends, so, on their request, he would agree to another General Assembly, although, from past experience, he did not anticipate any satisfactory result.

Three or four days before Good Friday, the provost and magistrates of Edinburgh received a letter from the king, commanding them to see that the inhabitants observed that solemn fast of the church, agreeably to the proclamation formerly issued. On that day, which fell on the 3d of April, proper officers were sent through the town, to see that no labour or trades were carried on; and in all the churches there were public worship and sermons. On Easter-day the communion was administered, and the people received it kneeling. At Witsunday, also, the same humble and becoming gesture was practised at the holy communion; and generally the irreverent sitting manner formerly in use was beginning to be laid aside. That shameful system of uniting parishes, begun by the regent Morton, was continued still, and the royal commissioners united two and sometimes three churches and parishes together, to the great detriment of religion and of the morality of the people.

On the 3d of August, a proclamation at the market-cross of Edinburgh indicted a General Assembly to meet at Perth on the 25th of the same month, and commanded all archbishops, bishops, and commissioners, to repair to Perth on the day appointed. The lord Binning, one of the principal secretaries of state, was appointed high commissioner, and the lords Scoone and Carnegey as his assessors. Archbishop Spottiswood took the chair as moderator, in his own right, as primate and metropolitan of the kingdom. The Assembly was composed of prelates, moderators of presbyteries, and minister commissioners, noblemen, and barons. The first day of the

meeting was ordered to be kept as a fast; the bishop of Aberdeen and the Archbishop of St. Andrews preached in defence of fasts and festivals in general, and also of the five articles to be proposed in particular; and to which James told them if they would not consent in that assembly, that he would impose them upon the church by his own innate power derived from God. Thomas Nicolson, the former clerk, resigned his office, and, at the recommendation of the archbishop, James Sandelands was appointed, who took his seat as clerk, and the oaths of office[1]. The king's letter, directed to the lords of the privy council and the bishops, was then presented by Dr. Young, dean of Winchester, and read to the Assembly:—

"James Rex.—Right reverend, &c. we greet you well.—We were once fully resolved never in our time to have called any more assemblies here, for ordering things concerning the policy of the church, by reason of the disgrace offered unto us in that late meeting of St. Andrews, wherein our just and godly desires were not only neglected, but some of the articles concluded in that scornful manner, as we wish they had been refused with the rest: yet at this time we have suffered to be intreated by you our bishops for a new convocation, and have called you together, who are now convened for the selfsame business which was then urged, hoping assuredly that you will have some better regard to our desires, and not permit the unruly and ignorant multitude, after their wonted custom, to oversway the better and more judicious sort in evil, which we have gone about with much pains to have amended in these assemblies, and for that purpose, according to God's ordinance and the constant practice of all well-governed churches, we have placed you that are bishops and overseers of the rest in the chiefest rooms. You plead much, we perceive, to have things done by consent of ministers, and tell us often, that what concerneth the church in general should be concluded by the advice of the whole; neither do we altogether dislike your opinion, for the greater your consent is the better are we contented. But we will not have you think that matters proposed by us, of the nature whereof these articles are, may not without such a general consent be enjoined by our authority.

"This were a misknowing of your places, and withal a disclaiming of that innate power which we have by our calling from God, whereby we have place to dispose of things external in the church as we shall think them to be convenient and profitable for advancing true religion among our subjects.

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. 537.—Calderwood, p. 699.

Wherefore let it be your care, by all manner of wise and discreet persuasions, to induce them to an obedient yielding to these things, as in duty both to God and us they are bound, and do not think we will be satisfied with delays, mitigations, and other we know not what shifts that have been proposed; for we will not be content with any thing but a simple and direct acceptation of these articles, in the form sent by us unto you a long time past, considering both the lawfulness and undeniable convenience of them for the better furtherance of piety and religion, the establishing whereof it had rather have becomed you to beg of us, than that we should have needed thus to urge the practice of them upon you.

"These matters, indeed, concern you of the ecclesiastical charge chiefly; neither would we have called noblemen, barons, and others of our good subjects, to the determination of them, but that we understand the offence of the people has been so much objected; wherein you must bear with us to say, that no kingdom doth breed or hath at this time more loving, dutiful, or obedient subjects, than we have in that our native kingdom of Scotland; and so, if any disposition hath appeared to the contrary in any of them, we hold the same to have proceeded from among you; albeit, of all sorts of men, ye are they which both of duty were bound, and by particular benefits were obliged to have continued yourselves, and confirmed others by sound doctrine and exemplary life, in a reverent obedience to our commandments. What and how many abuses were offered us by divers of the ministry there, before our happy coming to the crown of England, we can hardly forget, and yet like not much to remember; neither think we that any prince living should have kept himself from falling in utter dislike with the profession itself, considering the many provocations that were given unto us; but the love of God and his truth still upheld us, and will, by his grace, so do unto the end of our life. Our patience always, in forgetting and forgiving of many faults of that sort, and constant maintaining of true religion against the adversaries (by whose hateful practices we live in greater peril than you all, or any of you), should have produced better effects among you than continual resistance of our best purposes; we wish that we be no more provoked, nor the truth of God, which you teach and profess, any longer slandered by such as, under the cloak of seeming holiness, walk disorderly among you, shaking hands, as it were, and joining in this their disobedience to magistracy, with the upholders of popery. In sum, our hearty desire is, that at this time you make the world see, by your proceedings, what a di-

tiful respect you bear to us your sovereign prince and natural king and lord; that we in love and care are never wanting to you, so ye, in an humble submission to our so just demands, be not found inferior to others our subjects in any of our kingdoms. And that the care and zeal of the good of God's church, and of the advancing of piety and truth, doth chiefly incite us to the following of these matters, God is our witness: the which, that it may be before your eyes, and that according to your callings you may strive in your particular places, and in this general meeting, to do those things which may best serve to the promoting of the gospel of Christ, even our prayers are earnest to God for you; requiring you in this and other things to credit the bearer hereof, our servant and chaplain, the dean of Winchester (Dr. Young, a Scotchman by birth), whom we have chiefly sent thither, that he may bring unto us a certain relation of the particular carriages of all matters, and of the happy event of your meeting, which by God's blessing (who is the God of order, peace, and truth), we do assuredly assent; unto whose gracious direction we commend you now and for ever."

"Given at Theobalds, 10th July, 1618."

The king's letter having been read, recommending the five articles already mentioned, a committee was formed of "the most wise and discreet ministers." A long and fierce debate ensued both in committee and in the assembly; which ended, however, in adopting into the canons of the church the following conclusions, commonly called THE FIVE ARTICLES OF PERTH:—

I. That the holy sacrament be received meekly and reverently by the people on their knees.

II. That if any good christian, known to the pastor, be, by long visitation of sickness, unable to resort to the church, and shall earnestly desire to receive the communion in his own house, the minister shall not deny him so great a comfort, but shall administer it to him, with three or four to communicate with him, according to the form prescribed in the church.

III. That, in cases of great need and danger, the minister shall not refuse to baptize an infant in a private house, after the form used in the congregation; and shall, on the next Lord's day after, declare such private baptism to the people.

IV. That, for stopping the increase of popery, and settling true religion in the hearts of the people, it is thought good that the minister of every parish catechise the young children, of eight years of age, in the Belief, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer; and that children so instructed shall be

presented to the bishop, who shall bless them with prayer for the increase of their knowledge, and continuance of God's heavenly graces with them.

V. That considering how the inestimable benefits of our Lord's birth, passion, resurrection, ascension, and the sending down of the Holy Spirit, were commendably and godly remembered at certain particular days and times, by the whole church of the world, and may be so now; therefore it is thought meet, that every minister shall, on these days, make commemoration of the said inestimable benefits from pertinent texts of scripture, framing his doctrine and exhortation thereto, and rebuking all superstitious observations and licentious profanation thereof[1].

Dr. Lindsay, bishop of Brechin, says, in his account of this assembly, that the words chosen to distinguish the votes were, *agree*, *disagree*, and *non liquet*; eighty-six voted *agree*, forty-one voted *disagree*, and four *non liquet*. Calderwood gives many reasons to prove that this Assembly was a nullity, and of course that the articles were of no authority in the church. Nevertheless they were ratified by the privy council on the 21st of October, and proclaimed at the market-cross of Edinburgh on the 26th of the same month, with those formalities which gave proclamations the force of law. After the rising of this assembly, lord Binning, the chief commissioner, wrote the following account of it to the king, and which forms a complete refutation of all the lamentation, and mourning, and woe, which the presbyterians have since poured out upon it:—

"Most sacred sovereign,—At our coming to this town, finding that the most precise and wilful puritans were chosen commissioners by many of the presbyteries, especially of Lothian and Fife, I was extremely doubtful of the success of your majesty's religious and just desires. At the private meeting of your majesty's commissioners and the bishops, my lord of St. Andrews denied not the apparent difficulty; but declared, that being hopeful that the happiness which always accompanied the justice of your royal designs would not fail in this action, he thought the victory would be more perfect, and the obedience more hearty, when the puritans should see the articles concluded in the presence of their greatest patrons, their opinions being confuted by lively reasons and undeniable truth.

"The sermon before the Assembly was made by the bishop of Aberdeen, who, with great dexterity, proponed the weight

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. 385.—Calderwood, 713

of the purposes to be entreated, and the necessity of consideration; that the body of the church being assembled by your royal direction, for treating of articles proponed by your majesty, first to a number of the principal ministers at St. Andrews, and thereafter in the assembly at St. Andrews, your majesty had conceived great offence for the delays then used; and being persuaded, in your excellent wisdom and conscience, that the articles were just and godly, and only shifted because they were proponed by your majesty, by such as had gloried to be opposite to your sacred desires, it was to be feared, if, at this time, your majesty should not receive satisfaction, your wrath might be so kindled, as the church, losing your wonted fatherly favour, they might feel the heavy prejudice of that consequence; and, therefore, exhorted them, in humility, zeal, and christian love, to dispose themselves to proceed wisely, and with all due respect to your majesty.

"At the meeting of the assembly, the archbishop of St. Andrews made the exhortation: and, by a most wise and godly discourse, remembered the auditors of your majesty's infinite benefits to the church; your wisdom in their direction, for the keeping of purity, and suppressing popery; your patrocinie of the good; mercy to the offenders of their profession; care for provision and maintenance to pastors; and learning and zeal in defence of the true religion, by your most famous works published against the adversaries, which had incensed the papists to think your majesty the only let of their prevailing, and for that only quarrel to seek, by treacherous means, the trouble of your estate, and destruction of your sacred person; and the true professors through all Europe to honour your majesty as the protector of all the reformed churches, and to acknowledge your majesty the umpire, and most competent and best qualified judge, of all controversies arising amongst them. Exhorting, therefore, every one to consider and acknowledge how justly they were bound to express their loyal respect and true obedience to your majesty, by yielding to your lawful desires in the articles proponed.

"The exhortation ended, he called the commissioners and nominated these for the conference. Some proponed that a moderator might be chosen: whom he silenced, because he would not suffer the privilege of his place to be questioned: and, thereafter, rehearsing what had been done in the assembly at St. Andrews, and wittily taking it *pro confesso* that all the articles were in substance allowed there except that of kneeling at the communion, proponed that to be disputed. Great instance was made that the matter, being of so high consequence,

might be entreated in the public Assembly; but the contrary was ordained. Difficulty was made anent the conception of the words of the question, and the opposites urged that reasons might be given why the article was necessary. It was answered and concluded, that the articles coming from your majesty should be allowed, unless they could prove it were unlawful. So Master William Scott, of Cupar, being commanded to speak, opponed against the article with modesty, and protestation that he would be unwilling to adduce reasons to impugn a proposition coming from your majesty; and thereafter proceeding to his arguments, was seconded by Master John Carmichael, with more vehemency and wilfulness. They alleged, that the order presently observed in this country being agreeable to the word, and Christ's institution, and they sworn, at their admission to the ministry, to observe the true religion and discipline received in this church, they could not, with a safe conscience, alter it: which being censured, they came to the substance of the question anent the manner of receiving, and spent the rest of that day and a part of the next in disputation upon that subject; nothing being omitted by the adversaries which their own inventions, or the writings of those who allow their opinion, could suggest. Which being wisely and learnedly refuted by my lord of Glasgow, whom Dr. Lindsay, of Dundee, and Dr. Philp, of Arbroath, Dr. Bruce, and some others of the best and most learned, did assist with many evident and pithy reasons, the article was ordained to be voted in the conference, and in the end allowed by so great odds of voices as gave wonderful contentment to all the well-affected. Yet the number of the vulgar ministers having vote in the public Assembly being very great, our doubt rested what the event might be, of that which depended upon the opinions of a multitude of ignorant or pre-occupied people. For remeid thereof, my lord St. Andrews, who, in direction, disputation, and all other circumstances of this action, expressed great wisdom, learning, and authority, well beseeming his place, delayed the voting the second day, that he and his brethren might have some time to dispose things to a wished end.

"This day the bishop of Galloway made a very pertinent sermon to persuade the brethren to peace and edification. Thereafter the Assembly convening, new disturbances were casten in to reinverse all that was done in the conference, and bring it of new to disputation, so as my lord of St. Andrews was forced to permit all the articles to be of new reasoned; and if he had not by very grave authority reduced their discourses to succinct and formal reasoning, it had been impossible to

bring matters to any conclusion. Some oppositions made yesterday were this day repeated, and little of any substance added by such as were not of the conference; all which were judiciously and perspicuously refuted by my lords of St. Andrews and Glasgow, and Drs. Lindsay and Philp, whose faithful and profitable endeavours merit your majesty's gracious remembrance.

"If complaint be made by Master John Carmichael, that I would not suffer him to enlarge his discourse of the ancient controversy betwixt the Eastern and Western Churches anent the precise day of Christ's birth, I must have recourse to your majesty's mercy.

"In end, my lord St. Andrews, cutting short their affected shifts, whereby they intended either to disappoint the matter, or to persuade the Assembly to remit it to another meeting, he ordained this proposition only to be voted,—Whether the Assembly would obey your majesty in admitting the articles proponed by your majesty, or refuse them? Some insisted to have them severally voted: but both he and the dean of Winchester, (whose diligence, discretion, council, and good assistance in this service, have been faithful and very commendable,) declared, that your majesty would receive none, if all were not granted; and so being put to voting in these terms, four score and six allowed the articles, forty and one refused them, and three were *non liquet*.

"My lord of Scoon *antiquum obtinet*, and will never *aberrare a via regia*. My lord Carnegie, the treasurer-depute, advocate, Kilsyth, and Sir Andrew Carr, have done that faithful duty that became them.

"The earl of Lothian, the lords Sanquhar, Uchiltree, and Boyd, did likewise attend, with a good number of honourable and well-affected barons; but the praise of the success being only due to the wisdom of your majesty's directions, the worthiest instruments have been the two archbishops, and the bishops of Galloway and Aberdeen, and the remanent of their estate, of whom none were negligent or remiss, but professedly resolved in the advancement of the action. Many ministers kythed very dutifully both in reasoning and voting; but all these particulars I must remit to the dean of Winchester's relation: only assuring your majesty, that albeit the contention was vehement, both in the conference and public assembly, yet, after they were voted, there appeared great contentment in many good men's faces, for the happy and peaceable approbation of your majesty's articles. If your continual care of the good of this country and church move your royal mind to in-

tend hereafter any church matters of such consequence, I beseech your majesty, for the good of your own service, to employ a more fit commissioner in my place, who am as unskilful in thir subjects as I am ungracious to the oppesites. So thanking God for the blessed end of thir affairs, and praying him that your majesty may long live and happily prevail in all your royal enterprizes, I rest your majesty's most humble, faithful, and bound servant, "BINNING."

"St. Johnston, [Perth,] 27th August, at night, 1618.

"*To the King's Most Sacred Majesty.*"

Although these articles were passed by a majority of the Assembly, and were ordained to be intimated from all the pulpits in the kingdom, and the ministers were instructed to explain them to the people, and exhort them to obedience, yet the godly brethren of presbyterian sentiments universally neglected to do so. In Edinburgh, the people deserted their parish churches, where obedience to the acts was observed, and went in crowds to attend churches where "the sincerer sort" preached against their observance, and thundered anathemas on them, as popish superstitions. It seems surprising that, in a christian country, any opposition should have been made to such simple and innocent articles. If the sacrament of the Lord's supper is allowed to be necessary for salvation, it is more particularly desirable on the bed of sickness, and in the hour of death. And as it is declared, that without "being born again of water and of the Spirit, we cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven," it was unfeeling to refuse the laver of regeneration to a sickly infant at the point of death, which, rather than baptize at any other time than during sermon, they suffered to die without being made "a new creature?" The Jewish festivals were appointed by God himself, to be observed so long as the Aaronical priesthood should endure; and our Saviour, who came "not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it," invariably honoured all the Jewish festivals with his sacred presence. He was born at the feast of Tabernacles; He suffered the cruel and ignominious death of the cross at the Passover; and He sent the Comforter to guide his church unto all truth at the feast of Weeks, or Pentecost, now commonly called Whitsunday. This striking coincidence showed their relation and connection, and pointed out the correspondence of the type with the antitype, the shadow with the substance, the prediction with its accomplishment, and demonstrated to the faithful, that the Jewish and Christian religions are not two separate and unconnected dispensations, but were parts of one stupendous plan of redemp-

tion. Besides, the church has the example of the apostles themselves, and "the current sense of the church," in all ages, in all places, "among all nations, and kindreds, and people and tongues," from their times to the present day. It is not to be imagined that God himself would ordain the annual celebration of the types, which were but mere earthly blessings, and in which one nation only was interested, and yet intend the substance itself, in which *all the nations* of the earth are blessed, to be considered simply as historical events of no importance, and which were never once to be noticed, but to be thrown aside with contempt as popish superstitions.

1619.—In the end of the preceding year an unusually large comet appeared, which was thought by the superstitious to be of sinister omen. The Perth articles were passed, however, before it appeared, so it could not portend their introduction, as one of the later corruptions of the "sincerest kirk in the world." Queen Anne died just after its appearance, "to the great regret of all honest subjects: a courteous and humane princess, and one in whom there was much goodness[1]." The king was not very uxorious, "though he had a very brave queen." She never crossed his schemes or intentions, nor interfered with the politics or affairs of state; "but ever complied with him [the king] even against the nature of any but of a mild nature."

The obstinacy of many people, in refusing to yield obedience to the acts of the General Assembly of Perth, created many disputes, and much party spirit; and withal, the magistrates of Edinburgh were suspected of conniving at the general desertion of the churches. In some of them, likewise, even where the articles were acknowledged, the clergy treacherously condemned them in their sermons, as popish superstitious. Against such unreasonable and partizan opposition, it was impolitic to press the observance of the articles, till time had gradually worn off the prejudice, and had allowed the good sense of the people to resume its empire, which the measures of the court completely laid under the control of the most furious and violent of the godly brethren. In Edinburgh, the middling and lower classes persisted in their usual occupations on Christmas day; and several tradesmen were reprimanded in the Court of High Commission, and admonished to be more circumspect in future. The nobility, judges, and privy council, attended divine service at Christmas, and received the communion kneeling. Some of the clergy accused the magistrates of using them ill; and they in their turn denounced the clergy as being the

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. 540.

cause of the people's disobedience to the articles; some of them having directly preached against them, and affirmed that they had been passed against their inclinations. It will be recollected, that the obnoxious acts were proposed by the crown,—the bishops were merely ministerial in carrying the king's intentions into effect. They themselves, in the first instance, opposed their introduction, not as being improper in themselves, but as impolitic in the present hostile temper of the people; nevertheless, there was a large majority of the Assembly favourable to them. The king, on inquiry, found faults on both sides, as usual, and commanded the privy council to appoint other four ministers, and to complete the division of the city of Edinburgh into parishes. Severe measures were unhappily resorted to, to compel the refractory part of the clergy to officiate in their churches on the holidays, but more especially to administer the sacrament to the people kneeling[1]. According to Calderwood's account, a most perverse spirit actuated the people against kneeling at the communion, and the decision of the synod of Dort, against the *five* points of Arminius, was malevolently wrested to excite the minds of the people against the five acts of Perth. Richard Dickson, one of the ministers of St. Cuthberts, was deprived and imprisoned by the Court of High Commission, because, during the celebration of his communion, to which many of the puritans had resorted from other parishes, he "declared that the conclusion of the General Assembly was in itself *superstitious and damnable, and inclined for the most part to idolatry*[2]."

Contemporary with the Assembly of Perth, or soon after, the Synod of Dort met, and which unhappily king James so far countenanced as to send the bishop of Landaff to it as his representative. John Calvin has had the unenviable felicity of introducing more divisions, and envyings and strifes, into the church, than any individual since the days of Simon Magus. He has rendered the work of God the Son of no avail by his eternal decree; the commandments of God the Father a mere mockery, and the keeping of them by the promised assistance of God the Holy Ghost a matter of indifference. For upon *his* system, to what good purpose is it though the reprobate should keep the commandments with the utmost fidelity? or what bad consequence can result to the elect if they should wallow in all the works of the flesh? the one will, notwithstanding, be condemned, and the other will be saved, whatever their faith and works may be in this life. With all its infallibility

[1] Spottiswood, p. 540.—Calderwood, 721. [2] Calderwood, p. 722.

and despotism, even the Romish church has not been able to exclude these doctrines from being rooted and grounded in it; but presbytery long seems to have been its most congenial soil, which always cherished cold disquisitions, dark speculations on the *secret* things of God, and stern and gloomy sourness of disposition, naturally sliding into hypocrisy and infidelity. The Lutherans were shocked at Calvin's system, and a fierce contention was excited amongst the foreign protestants. James Arminius was at this time professor of divinity at Leyden, and being himself a disciple of Calvin's school, was employed to refute the Lutheran sentiments. This could not be done without research and study; and his inquiries led him to an opposite conclusion, and in consequence of his learning, and close examination of the subject, he became a more formidable opponent to the Calvinists than had hitherto appeared. He died in 1609, but his party increased, and soon after presented a remonstrance to the States of Holland containing *five* points. 1. That God in election and reprobation has regard to faith and perseverance in the one, and to unbelief and impenitence in the other. 2. That Jesus Christ died for all men. 3. That by the assistance of divine grace the commandments of God may be kept. 4. That this grace is not irresistible. 5. That the regenerate may fall into deadly sin. These points were in direct opposition to the five Calvinistic tenets, which maintain—1, absolute election and reprobation; 2, the irresistibility of grace; 3, the impossibility of keeping the commandments; 4, the certain perseverance of the regenerate [in their sense]; and 5, that Christ died only for the elect [in their sense of election[1]].

To allay the ferocious disputes which these opposite opinions had excited, the States of Holland convoked a synod at Dort, in which the opinions of Arminius were synodically condemned, and their supporters delivered over to the persecution of the secular arm. The presbyterian party in Scotland applied to this synod, and complained of episcopacy and the Perth articles, but without effect, as it was not discipline but doctrine which occupied the synod's attention. Our puritans, however, derived some temporary advantage from the decision of this convocation; for they falsely represented to the people that the condemnation of the *five* Arminian points was the solemn decision of that synod *against the five articles of Perth!* The advocates of all false systems of religion have ever supported them "after the working of Satan, with all power and signs

[1] Skinner's Eccl. Hist. ii. 270-71.

and *lying* wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness." Pamphlets were published to circulate this gross and well-known falsehood; but which were ably refuted by Dr. Lindsay, bishop of Brechin, and "by the singularly learned Dr. John Forbes, professor of divinity at Aberdeen, and son to the worthy Patrick Forbes of Corse, the then bishop of that see, both which defences are sufficient to vindicate the lawfulness and obligation of the Perth articles, as they are called, from all the noisy and insignificant clamours that ever were or ever will be raised against them[1]."

Among other inconveniences of the holy discipline was that gainsaying, after the manner of Core, of the people meeting a few days previous to the communion to *censure* their minister, and to sit in judgment on his moral character, and the doctrine which he taught. A meeting for this purpose took place on Tuesday, the 23d of March, previous to the solemn commemoration of our Lord's resurrection at Easter, when Mr. William Rigge, their leader, censured and condemned in very severe terms all the clergy who observed the Perth articles. This custom, which shewed that the laity knew not of what manner of spirit they were, was put a stop to by the king, and it reflects some discredit on the clergy of that time that they tamely submitted to it[2].

Dr. William Cowper, bishop of Galloway, suffered severely from morbid sensibility and the scurrilous invectives of the godly brethren respecting the synod of Perth, which he took so much to heart as to cause his death. "He was an excellent and ready preacher, and a singular good man, but one that affected too much the applause of the popular. The good opinion of the people is to be desired, if it may be had lawfully; but when it cannot be obtained (. . . . .) the testimony of a well-informed conscience should suffice." Upon his death, Mr. Andrew Lambe was translated from Brechin to Galloway; and Mr. David Lindsay, minister of Dundee, was consecrated on the 23d of November, by archbishop Spottiswood, in the chapel of the Castle of St. Andrews[3].

In June, 1620, proclamation was again made at the cross of Edinburgh, for obedience to the Perth articles, to which the majority of the clergy throughout the kingdom were favourable. Those, however, who were scared with the "holy discipline," encouraged the most irreverent and indecent conduct, and obstinately recommended their flocks to sit, stand, and even to walk about, while they helped themselves to the sacred symbols.

[1] Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, 268. [2] Calderwood, p. 723.
[3] Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 516.—Calderwood, p. 736.

The refractory clergy were summoned to answer for this contumacy in the Court of High Commission; and thus, in the eyes of their deluded followers, they were elevated to the rank of martyrs.

1621.—On Monday, the 27th of March, the archbishop of St. Andrews presented the king's letter to the privy council, commanding the members and the College of Justice to keep the feast of Easter with due solemnity. By proclamation, all parties who had bills or petitions to present to parliament were ordered to send them to a committee of the privy council on or before the 20th of May: but Calderwood heavily complains that "that liberty which ministers were wont to have of a General Assembly, to send commissioners with articles to the estates convened in parliament, was denied to them; howbeit great was the necessity long before, and now specially, when papists had become so insolent, and ministers were divided among themselves[1]." The good man forgot that the heads of the church were one of the estates of parliament through whom all its petitions and articles found a legitimate channel. Secret meetings were held by the "sincerer sort" of the ministers, who were terrified at the prospect of the Perth articles being confirmed in the ensuing parliament, and they revived an old device of theirs, of proclaiming a fast throughout the whole kingdom on the two last *Sundays* in June, "for contempt of the word, the preservation of the king and his children, the Turks laying in wait to invade Europe, . . . and the persecution of the kirks of Germany and France."

Parliament was summoned to meet on the 1st of June, but was prorogued till the 23d of July, when it met for the dispatch of business. James, marquis of Hamilton and duke of Chatelherault, was sent down as lord high commissioner. A supply of four hundred thousand pounds Scots was granted to the sovereign. Some other acts were also passed for the correction of the forms of procedure in the courts of justice, and for the regulation of the police and manners of the country. One of the chief objects of this parliament was to confirm the Five Articles of Perth. The sincerer sort had openly boasted that the king should not be able to accomplish that point; and they came to Edinburgh in full force, with the intention of making the most strenuous efforts in opposition to the measures of the king's ministers. The commissioner ordered all the ministers, by proclamation, to leave the capital within twenty-four hours, except the ordinary parochial clergy; but Alex-

[1] True History, p. 759.

ander Simpson and Andrew Duncan, two of the number that protested against the five articles, and threatened to create a disturbance, he committed to Dumbarton Castle[1]. About thirty of the ministers had left their cure of souls to meet in Edinburgh, in a private house, "to concur," as they said, "for the weal of the kirk, and according to the ancient custom thereof, observed before in parliament, to consult upon weighty affairs, as the present case requireth consideration." Previous to obeying the proclamation they drew up a protest against the legality of the Perth Assembly, and of the articles there enacted. The five acts were, however, ratified and confirmed in this parliament without any opposition, and ordained henceforth "to be obeyed and observed by all his majesty's subjects as law in time coming; annulling and rescinding whatsoever other acts of parliament, constitutions and customs, in so far as they are derogative to any of the articles above written[2]."

This was James's last parliament, and that wherein he received the greatest satisfaction; hoping that the remnant of the Melvillian faction would now learn wisdom with the failure of their seditious intentions. It was dissolved on the 4th of August, and he wrote to the bishops and to the council, recommending their utmost care and vigilance. To the bishops he said, "that, as they had to do with two sorts of enemies, papists and puritans, so they should go forward in action, both against the one and the other; that papistry was a disease of the mind, and puritanism of the brain;—and the antidote for both, a grave, settled, and well-ordered church, in the obedience of God and their king." He put the privy council in mind of what he had written in his Basilicon Doron, "that he would have reformation begin at his own elbow, which he esteemed the privy council and session, with their members, to be, as having their places and promotion by him. He therefore commanded them to conform themselves to the obedience of the orders of the church established by law; and he did assure them, that if within fourteen days before Christmas they did not resolve to conform themselves, they should lose their places in his service." In the same letter he commanded the council to take order "that none should bear office in any burgh, nor be chosen sheriff deputy, or clerk, but such as conformed in all points to the said orders." It never was neces-

[1] Balfour's Annals, ii. 91.

[2] Calderwood, 766 — Ibid. 782. — Spottiswood, b. vii. p. 542. — Balfour's Annals, ii. 94.

sary to put these rigorous and impolitic measures in force, inasmuch as the great majority of the nation quietly received and obeyed the Perth articles. It was the sincerer sort, or presbyterian brethren only, that, with their characteristic spirit of opposition, resisted the acts of the General Assembly, and drew off the ignorant and discontented people to separate conventicles. James's views were liberal and benevolent; and had he known the secret of toleration, and suffered the dissentients to have enjoyed their own opinions in separate communions, much of the rancour and embittered feelings, which subsequently distracted and ruined that church, might have been prevented; but toleration for the opinions or prejudices of others was neither understood nor practised by either party at that time.

When the king's commissioner rose to touch the Perth acts with the sceptre, the token in the Scottish parliament of the royal assent, a fearful flash of lightning illuminated the hall; after that, a second and a third, which were succeeded by thick darkness, to the astonishment and dismay of the members. The lightning, as usual, was succeeded by three loud claps of of thunder, and a deluge of rain, so that in "the riding," the noblemen and others were compelled to leave their horses and betake themselves to their coaches. The godly brethren did not fail to interpret this natural occurrence as a sure and visible sign of God's anger on the nation for ratifying the acts of Perth, while others again said it was a sign of heaven's approbation, like the thunderings and lightnings at the giving of the law on Mount Sinai. The sincerer sort called this memorable day "the Black Saturday," which, says Calderwood, "began with fire from the earth in the morning" [the discharge of cannon from the castle], "and ended with fire from heaven in the evening;" and he says that this verified his prophecy, "that the parliament could not end well, the beginning was so evil favoured: they were banishing God, and bringing in the devil[1]."

1622-24.—The Melvillian party made a handle of the Perth articles to keep up that active agitation which the vigorous and prudent government of the bishops had almost suppressed. All those inclined for episcopacy, which were nine-tenths of the nation, received the Perth articles without a murmur, as a decent and commendable order. Some of the sincerer brethren, especially in Edinburgh, the old watch-tower of the presbyterian party, had been particularly obnoxious for their dogmatic

[1] True History, pp. 765-783.—Balfour's Annals, ii. 91.

resistance to the law. They formed a cabal in the year 1624, at the head of which was William Rigge, one of the bailies or aldermen, who would have quietly sunk into an unknown and unhonoured clod of the valley, but for this opportunity of signalizing his opposition. During the supremacy of the holy discipline, a system very much on the plan of Korah and his company was introduced, of meeting previous to the celebration of the holy sacrament, and condemning or applauding, as it suited their tastes or humours, the doctrines previously taught in the pulpit, with the view of fixing the holy discipline in the affections of the people. In conformity with this democratic habit, Rigge challenged Dr. Forbes, afterwards the first bishop of Edinburgh, to submit the doctrines which he taught, to his censure and that of some others of Rigge's sentiments; but he justly declined to permit a layman to pass a judicial censure on his sermons. Rigge therefore openly threatened him and the other conforming clergy, that unless they all returned to the old method of administering the sacrament, by sitting round long tables and helping themselves to the elements, instead of the mode enjoined by the Perth Assembly, of reverently kneeling and receiving the sacred symbols out of the presbyter's hands, that the whole people should forsake them. Rigge, with his party, were summoned before the privy council: the former was deprived of his civic dignity, and rendered for ever after incapable of holding office; and the latter were charged to depart the city. The privy council ordained that the ministers should reside in their parishes, and all popular elections to be discontinued, and the patronage of the city churches to be vested in the magistrates. Likewise, that those most inconsistent parochial meetings, wherein the people censured their clergymen, and all conventicles and privy nocturnal meetings, which, says Balfour, "is the only introducer of schism, and all sorts of damnable heresies in God's church," should be peremptorily prohibited[1]. These parochial censorships were the result of building on the sandy foundations of the people. "The priest's lips are to preserve knowledge," but if his doctrine is to be made subservient to the ignorance and capricious opinions, and subject to the censorship of those whose duty it is to receive instruction from their appointed guides, it is not to be supposed that he would "rightly divide the word of truth," when obliged to tickle the itching ears of captious censors with popular doctrines.

[1] Balfour's Annals, ii. 99.—Calderwood. 806.—Spottiswood, 545.

1625.—In the month of March, James was seized with a disease, which his physicians termed a tertian ague, but it is supposed they mistook his complaint, which was gout, and by improper remedies drove it from his feet to the vital parts. When the prince of Wales was introduced to his bedside, he desired him to love his future wife, but to avoid her religion. He expired at Theobalds, with great calmness and composure, on the 27th of March, being Sunday, at noon. On Thursday preceding he desired to have the holy sacrament administered to him, which he received with great devotion; and professed to the prince of Wales that he had received a singular comfort thereby. "He was the Solomon of his age, admired for his government, and for his knowledge of all manner of learning. For his wisdom, moderation, love of justice; for his patience and piety (which shined above all his other virtues, and is witnessed in the learned works he left to posterity), his name shall never be forgotten, but remain in honour so long as the world endureth[1]." Sir James Balfour ascribes his death to poison, administered by his most unworthy favourite, the duke of Buckingham. He says,—"Died king James, of most famous and worthy memory, surnamed the *king of peace*, honoured and admired by the greatest kings of the world, for his wisdom and prudent government; *not without great and pregnant suspicion of poison*[2]."

He declared on his death-bed that he died in the communion of the church of England, and faithfully attached to both her doctrine and discipline. His actual reign over Scotland was nearly commensurate with his life, and he reigned over Great Britain and Ireland twenty-two years and three days. Writers of all creeds and politics have agreed to exaggerate his failings, and, following the tactics of the Melvillian party, have heaped obloquy and vituperation on his memory, forgetting, in the heat of religious animosity, that the manners and sentiments of the age in which he flourished were essentially different from those of the present. He is accused of having been coarse, awkward, and ungainly in his manners: but it should be at the same time recollected, that he had no female court in which to form his manners in early life. His preceptors and courtiers in youth were rebels, regicides, and public robbers, in whose hands he was a mere tool to answer their guilty ends. Had not Moray been cut short in his guilty career by the hand of an infamous assassin, it is probable that

[1] Spottiswood, b. vii. 516. [2] Balfour's Annals, vol. ii. An. 1625, p. 102.

his life would have been sacrificed to the regent's inordinate ambition.

James was a man of undoubted abilities. At the age of eighteen he emancipated himself from the trammels of the regicides, and his kingdom from the sovereignty of Elizabeth, to whom it had been delivered by the regent. She governed it all the time of the four regents, till James restored his country's freedom, and taught that despot to respect him as the sovereign of an independent kingdom. By his sagacity and prudence, he conciliated not only her good will, but the hearty good wishes of both the Anglo-Catholics and the papists, for his succession to the throne of England. We are informed that God keeps the hearts of kings in his own hands—the truth of which was powerfully exemplified in James. Buchanan, his preceptor, instilled into his young mind the most democratic and republican principles, but which he repudiated when he assumed the reins of government. The same Power under whose rule and governance are the hearts of kings, also "stilleth the unruly wills of men." The ancient national jealousies and antipathies were entirely laid aside, and the English nation, as one man, hailed his accession to the throne of England; there was not one dissentient voice in the whole kingdom, which marks the finger of God. James restored to England the line of her ancient Saxon monarchs, being lineally descended from Margaret Atheling, the daughter of the true heir of the throne of England of the Saxon line.

Great obloquy has been thrown on James by the presbyterian party, because, as they allege, he deserted "the sincerest kirk in the world," where alone "was the pure light of the gospel," and became a convert to the church of England. He cannot be called a convert to that church, inasmuch as he was educated a member of a titular episcopal church, which, we have Buchanan's assurance, was in communion with the church of England, and "subscribed to its rites and ceremonies;" and the whole object of his reign was to bring the titular church of Scotland to conformity and unity, as far as circumstances would admit, with the church of England. When he assumed the reins of government, he found a nominal episcopacy established as the religion of his kingdom; and when he afterwards consented to the establishment of presbytery, he reluctantly yielded to a torrent which he found himself incapable of controling. From its determined imitation of the church of Rome in usurping a supremacy over the crown, and in assuming an unlimited censorial control over all conditions, from the prince to the peasant, he was compelled to set it

aside, not however before its tyranny was become intolerable to the nation, and to restore the same titular episcopacy which he found established when he ascended the throne.

In his answer to Bellarmine[1], he himself refutes the calumny of his ever having been a presbyterian:—"I am no apostate," he says, "as the Cardinal would make me, not only having *ever been brought up in that religion which I presently profess*, but even my father and grandfather on that side professing the same: and so cannot be properly a heretic, by their own doctrine, since I never was of their church. And as for the queen, my mother, of worthy memory, although she continued in that religion wherein she was nourished, yet was she far from being superstitious or jesuitic therein ..... as in all her letters (whereof I received many) she never made mention of religion, nor laboured to persuade me in it; so at her last words, she commanded her master-household . . : . . to tell me, 'that although she was of another religion than that wherein I was brought up, yet she would not press on me to change, except my own conscience forced me to it; for so that I led a good life, and were careful to do justice and govern well, she doubted not but I should be in a good case with the profession of my own religion.' Thus I am no apostate, nor yet a deborder from that religion which one part of my parents professed, and another part gave me good allowance of. Neither can my baptism in the rites of their religion make me an apostate or heretic in respect of my present profession, since we all agree in the substance thereof, being all baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, upon which there is no variance among us."

And upon the subject of ecclesiastical government, he says, "That bishops ought to be in the church, I ever maintained as an apostolic institution, and so the ordinance of God; contrary to the puritans, and likewise to Bellarmine, who denies that bishops have their jurisdiction immediately from God; (but it is no wonder he takes the puritans' part, since jesuits are nothing but puritan-papists.) And as I ever maintained the estate of bishops, and the ecclesiastical hierarchy for order sake, so was I ever an enemy to the confused anarchy or parity of the puritans, as well appeareth in my Basilicon Doron. Heaven is governed by order, and all the good angels there, nay, hell itself, could not subsist without some order; and the very devils are divided into legions, and have their chieftains; how can any society, then, upon earth subsist without order

[1] Cited in Scott. Ep. Mag. for March 1821, p. 51, vol. ii.

and degrees? And therefore I cannot enough wonder with what brazen face any one can say that I was a puritan in Scotland, and an enemy to protestants,—I that was persecuted by puritans there, not from my birth only, but ever since four months before my birth!—I that in the year of God 84, erected bishops, and depressed all their popular party, I then being not 18 years of age!—I that in my said book to my son, do speak ten times more bitterly of them nor of the papists, having in my second edition thereof affixed a long apologetic preface, only in *odium puritanorum!*—and I that, for the space of six years before my coming into England, laboured nothing so much as to depress their parity, and re-erect bishops again! —Nay, if the daily commentaries of my life and actions in Scotland were written (as Julius Cæsar's were), there would scarcely a month pass in all my life, since my entering on the 13th year of my age, wherein some accident or other would not convice the cardinal of a lie in this point. And surely I give a fair commendation to the puritans in that place of my book where I affirm, that I have found greater honesty with the highland and border thieves, than with that sort of people[1]."

In appointing the Scottish bishops, James took the most effectual method of securing a succession of the most eminent and pious men: it was his custom, when a bishopric fell void, to appoint the archbishop of St. Andrews to convene the others, and name three or four well qualified, so that there could not be an error in the choice, and then out of the list the king selected one whom he preferred[2].

In consequence of his continual bickerings with the factious and irreverent presbyterian brethren, and the errors of his education, he was apt to speak rashly and unadvisedly with his lips; but which afterwards he heartily lamented and bewailed, and said he hoped God would not impute his taking his holy name in vain as sins, and lay them to his charge, seeing they proceeded from passion. Yet it is a remarkable circumstance, vouched by Fuller, that in the presence of bishop Andrews, who was himself of a facetious disposition, James invariably ceased his levity and rashness of speech, and always stood much in awe of him.

"He was very witty, and had as many ready witty jests as any man living; at which he would not smile himself, but deliver them in a grave and serious manner. He was very libe-

[1] Extract from a curious work, by James VI. in Ep. Mag. ii. 55.
[2] Guthry's Mem. 16.

ral of what he had not in his own grip, and would rather part with £100 he never had in his own keeping, than one twenty-shilling-piece within his own custody. He spent much, and had much use of his subjects' purses, which bred much clashings with them in the parliament, yet would he always come off and end with a sweet and plausible close..... In a word, he was, take him altogether (and not in pieces), such a king I wish this kingdom have never any worse, on the condition not any better; for he lived in peace, died in peace, and left all his kingdoms in a peaceable condition, with his own motto:—*Beati pacifici*[1].

[1] Balfour's Annals, ii. 108-115.

An Epitaph upon king James's death, written by the Rev. Dr. Morley, of Corpus Christi College, Oxford:—

"All who have eyes awake and weep,
For he whose waking wrought our sleep
Is fallen asleep himself, and never
Shall awake again till wak'd for ever:
Death's iron hand hath closed those eyes
Which were at once three kingdoms' spies,
Both to foresee, and to prevent
Dangers as soon as they were meant.
That head, whose working brain alone
Wrought all men's quiet but its own,
Now lies at rest. O let him have
The peace he lent us, in his grave.
If that no Naboth all his reign
Was for his fruitful vineyard slain;
If no Uriah lost his life
Because he had too fair a wife;
Then let no Shimei's curses wound
His honour, or profane his ground,
Let no black-mouth'd, no rank-breath'd cur
Peaceful James his ashes stir.
Princes are gods; O! do not, then,
Rake in their graves to prove them men.
For two-and-twenty years' long care;
For providing such an heir,
Who to the peace we had before
May add twice two-and-twenty more;
For his days' travels and nights' watches;
For his craz'd sleep, stol'n by snatches;
For two fair kingdoms join'd in one;
For all he did, or meant t' have done;
Do this for him—write on his dust,
JAMES, THE PEACEFUL AND THE JUST."

CHAPTER XIII.

PRIMACY OF ARCHBISHOP SPOTTISWOOD.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF CHARLES I. TILL THE RIOT ON ACCOUNT OF THE LITURGY.

1625.—Accession of Charles I.—Proclaimed.—Marriage of the king.—Some items of the marriage contract.—The queen's popish domestics sent out of the kingdom.—The king's embarrassments.—Intrigues of the presbyterian party—send a deputation to court—fasts—the nobility unite with the disaffected ministers.——1626.—Charles determined to follow out his father's plans.—Attempt to resume the church lands—difficulties experienced.—Alterations in the Court of Session.—Prelates made privy councillors.—Lenity shewn to those who scrupled to comply with the Perth articles.——1627.—Measures for the suppression of popery.—Conference.—Petition to the king.—Tithe commissioners.—Popular alarm.—Discontent and intrigues of the nobility.—Commission for taking surrendries.——1628.—Opposition to kneeling at the communion.—Things indifferent.—The king's letter.—Tactics of the non-conformists.—Arminianism.—Popery.—A fast.—Consecration of bishop Leslie.——1629.—External peace of the church.——1630.—King's desire for uniformity.—Letter from Struthers, a minister, to the earl of Airth.—Charles, prince of Wales, born.—State of the presbyterians.—Enthusiasm at the kirk of Shotts.—Convention of estates.—Petitions—the oaths.——1631.—Birth of princess Mary.——1632.—Death of archbishop Law.—Translation of bishop Lindsay.——1633.—Charles's progress—his entry into Edinburgh—procession from the castle—coronation—his oath.—Bishop Laud preaches.—Archbishop of Glasgow.—Meeting of parliament.—Ratification of the acts touching religion.—The king's own account of the passing of the acts.—Hogg's petition—rejected.—Foundation of the solemn league and covenant.—Intrigues of Rothes.—Balmerino circulates the petition.—The liturgy.—Dr. Laud made a privy councillor.—Conferences respecting the liturgy—Arguments for one different from the English form—A new compilation determined on—not the work of archbishop Laud.—Charges against Laud.——1634.—Erection of the bishopric of Edinburgh.—Consecration of bishop Forbes—his character—his charge.—Conformity required.—Many refuse to conform.—Bishop Forbes's death—his writings.—Bishop Laud ay promoted to Edinburgh.—Sydserf.—Haig's petition—privately circulated.—Balmerino committed—tried and condemned—pardoned.—Death of archbishop Abbott—his character.——1635.—Spottiswood made chancellor.—Deaths and translations of bishops.——1636.—Lord Traquair.—Book of canons.—Opposition.—Clamour of the non-conformists.—Traquair's duplicity.—Note, account of the new liturgy.—Agitation.—Publication of a liturgy—the same as that of

Edward VI.—Cardinal Richlieu's intrigues.—State of parties.——1637.—Agitation against the liturgy.—Death of bishop Boyd.—Consecration of James Fairly.—Liturgy ordered to be read—read quietly in some places on Easter-Day—read in St. Giles's—a riot—violence of the mob.—Traquair's treachery.—King's letter to the council.—Synod of Glasgow.—Principal Baillie refuses to preach.—Mr. Annand's sermon.—Mr. Annand assaulted—escapes with difficulty—Henderson's opposition.—Treachery of the privy council.—Multitudes flock to Edinburgh.—Activity of the non-conforming ministers.—Proclamation.—Riotous assemblage of women—The bishop of Galloway assaulted.—The TABLES—their proceedings.—Justice craved on the bishops.—"Declinature" against the bishops.—The liturgy in compliance with a former petition—Extract from its preface.—Indifference in England to the Scottish troubles.—The people's delusion.

1625.—On the death of James VI., his only surviving son, CHARLES, was proclaimed king, to the universal joy and satisfaction of the whole nation; and on Thursday, the 31st of March, he was solemnly proclaimed, at the Cross of Edinburgh, at two o'clock in the afternoon, by the lords of his majesty's privy council. Immediately on his accession he wrote to the council, and directed them to make known, by proclamation, his will and pleasure that all manner of magistrates and officers in his dominions should continue to hold, use, and exercise all the power and authority which they held under the late king, until his further pleasure was known. In April, the greater part of the privy council, with many of the nobility, went to London, to kiss hands and congratulate the king on his accession, and to attend the funeral of the late king; and lord Carnegy was left to govern the kingdom until their return[1].

On the 8th of May, Charles was married by proxy to Henrietta Maria, sister of Louis XIII. king of France, according to the rites and ceremonies of the Roman church. The queen arrived at Dover on Trinity Sunday, and their nuptials were celebrated at Whitehall on Tuesday the 21st of June, in honour of which "the king held a werey royall feast at Whitehall." This marriage was the beginning of sorrows. No prince who had ever ascended the throne had the honour and interest of religion more truly at heart than Charles; but this alliance with IDOLATRY was the grand and leading misfortune of his whole reign. Although he himself was firmly opposed to popery, yet he was regardless of the danger to the constitution and of the popish dynasty which he thus entailed upon the throne. By the marriage contract, the royal children were

[1] Balfour's Annals, ii. 115, 116.

to be educated by their mother until they attained the age of thirteen; and lest they should be tainted by protestant milk, a clause was inserted, providing that the children *should not be suckled by protestant nurses*[1]. The object of these stipulations was so transparent, that Charles must have looked forward to a popish succession; and so effectual were these precautions, that all his family, even to the last fragment of his line, were papists. Henrietta was a true papist; restless, intriguing, and proselytising. The king, says Coxe, "was much troubled with the *ill company* she brought with her from France; so that being at length scandalized at their insolence, *and their tampering in matters of religion*, he dismissed them into their own country, and war thereupon immediately ensued with the French king." This happened in the year 1627, as we are informed by Rapin. The king was indignant at the insolence of the queen's domestics, who maintained that, being a *heretic*, he had no right to interfere in the regulation of her family. And he was disgusted at the presumption of her chaplains, who made the queen perform the penance of walking barefoot to Tyburn, to perform certain devotions at that notorious place of execution. By means of this inauspicious marriage, papal idolatry gained a footing in the very court, and although the French party were bound down by treaties not to interfere in religious matters, yet such treaties were merely waste paper to the members of a church which makes it a merit, worthy of everlasting bliss, to keep *no faith* with heretics. The queen's popish attendants eagerly seized every opportunity of advancing the interests and pretensions of popery, and so artfully managed their intrigues that the whole court was involved in the meshes of religious controversy and animosity. Charles came to the throne embarrassed by a war with Spain, which he had not money to carry on, though undertaken by the advice of parliament; and afterwards entering into one with France, he had little leisure to turn his attention to the church of Scotland, nor did he require to do so for some years. By the prudent and vigorous measures of the late king, the government of the church was peaceably regulated, and the whole nation yielded a willing obedience to the episcopacy so happily established. A few only of the sincerer sort kept up a spirit of discontent and opposition to the Perth articles, by presenting to the several parliaments their protestations against them, but which met with little attention. On the accession of Charles to the throne, and conceiv-

[1] Preface to Rev. George Croly's work on Prophecy.

ing that he was favourable to the English puritans, they sent Mr. Robert Scot, one of the ministers of Glasgow, to court with a petition, praying for relief from compliance with the five articles of Perth, and the intolerable burden of episcopacy. They found Charles, however, to be conscientiously attached to the church which his father with so much care had established, and for which he himself was destined to die a martyr. To archbishop Spottiswood he soon after wrote, and assured him and the other bishops of his royal protection and favour, and of his resolution to maintain the integrity of the Scottish church. He desired the archbishop to continue in the good course so happily begun, and to require the other bishops to maintain the order and laws in their several dioceses which his royal father had enjoined and established by the authority of parliament.

Disappointed in their expectations, the sincerer sort set themselves clandestinely, but actively, to increase the number of their adherents. They were most successful in Fife and the western counties, which have always been most addicted to the holy discipline. It was the custom of the presbyterian party, whenever they had any project in contemplation, to commence the business with fasting. Fasts were accordingly resorted to as an expedient for gaining proselytes; they were not openly and avowedly proclaimed, but they were known to the godly by secret intimation. Wherever a godly brother was settled, on the first Sunday of every quarter secret intimation was given to the initiated of the sincerer stamp, and those whom they could trust or could draw over to their party, when they met in their churches; and on these occasions they poured forth the vials of their vituperation on the bishops, denouncing them as relics of popery, *malignants*, and tyrants, and they alarmed the minds of their hearers with the imaginary dangers threatened to religion and civil liberty by prelacy and its dependencies. They prayed for a blessing on their efforts to uproot and destroy it, by all their usual means of tumult, disorder, and rebellion, and they so roused the passions of the people, and inflamed them with visionary grievances, that many proselytes were gained, and thus they paved the way for the horrid scenes which followed[1]. But what turned out more to their advantage, and gave them greater confidence, was the accession of several noblemen to their party: Rothes, Lindsay, Lothian, Balmerino, Cassilis, Eglinton, and Loudon, all joined the disaffected brethren. These noblemen were in constant apprehen-

[1] Guthry's Mem. 8, 10.

sion that Charles would resume the tithes and church lands, which had been seized by them and others in the minorities of the two last reigns, when, by the destruction of the papal hierarchy, there were no legal possessors who could claim or hold them

In December, Edinburgh was divided into four distinct parishes, and two ministers were assigned to each; and in January of the following year, the incumbents were inducted to their respective charges by the bishop of Brechin[1].

1626.—It was James's full intention to have recovered the tithes and church lands out of the hands of the lay impropriators, but he deferred the execution of this design on account of the opposition that was made to the Perth articles. Charles determined to follow up his father's intentions, and also to annul all the grants made by the regents, during the minority of the late reign, of the lands belonging to cathedrals and religious houses. By the advice of his privy council he proceeded to the recovery of his rights in those lands and regalities, which he endeavoured to effect, first by an act of revocation, and failing that, by a commission for surrendering the superiorities[2]. In January the king signified his pleasure to the privy council respecting the late revocation, of which, says Balfour, "the kingdom conceived so much *prejudice, and in effect was the ground stone of all the mischief that followed after, both to this king's government and family*[3]." "It was a *Scotch faction*," says Mr. Napier, "that in the seventeenth century, when paving the way to such enormities as the murders of Charles I. and Montrose, had wielded the destinies and decided the fate of England. The savage contempt for royal authority, the arts of popular agitation, the spirit of persecution, that instantly sprung up to clear the path for democracy, these characteristics of the tumults and insurrection of Scotland in the years 1637, 1638, and 1639, all extended to England, where the puritanical faction were ready to adopt the lessons, and eager to profit by the active co-operation, of instructors they otherwise despised. Clothed with the *language* of loyalty and patriotism, and advancing under cover of 'religion and liberties,' the determined besiegers of monarchical government worked up from Scotland to the throne itself[4]."

The king secretly purchased from the families of Hamilton and Lennox the abbey of Arbroath and lordship of Glasgow, and bestowed them on the two archbishoprics. The present

[1] Stevenson's History of the Church and State of Scotland; edit. 1840, p. 101.
[2] Echard's Hist. 102. [3] Balfour's Annals, v. ii. 128.
[4] Montrose and the Covenanters, i. 21.

revocation was strictly legal, and was confined to the tithes and benefices reverting, after the reformation, to the sovereign, but which had, by the act of annexation, been exhausted in gifts to the rapacious nobles. But the plunder of the church had been too general, and its possession had been too long, to be quietly or cheerfully restored. Many of the gentry, and almost all the nobility, had been enriched with its plunder; but a convention of estates rejected every proposition for the surrender of the tithes. The king was incensed, and published the act of revocation, comprehending every grant of the two preceding reigns, which alarmed and exasperated the nobles. Balfour[1] says, that one of the king's chief reasons was "in respect his great grandfather, king James V., his grandmother, queen Mary, and his own father, king James VI., had done the like, to revoke acts and deeds done in their minority to the detriment of the crown." The king employed the earl of Nithsdale as commissioner to parliament, with instructions to procure the surrender of the tithes. On his arrival in Edinburgh, and the purport of his journey being known, the impropriators and possessors of the church lands met, and agreed, that if no other argument prevailed with lord Nithsdale to avert their resumption, that they should massacre him, and all his party, in the parliament house. Lord Belhaven, who was old and blind, at his own request was placed next to the earl of Dumfries, whom he grasped with one hand, pretending weakness, and with the other held a dagger concealed, ready to plunge it into his heart on the least commotion. The fierce opposition which the commissioner experienced convinced him of the impossibility of accomplishing his master's instructions, and he accordingly returned to court without having effected any thing; and nothing further was attempted for some time[2].

In order that justice might be duly administered, Charles wrote to the privy council to make considerable alterations in the courts of law, and to place the Court of Session as nearly as possible on its original foundation. The Court of Session, which answers to the Queen's Bench in England, was originally projected by John duke of Albany, regent of the kingdom in the minority of James V., who applied for and received a papal bull from Clement VII., empowering him to tax the prelates for its support. The opposition of the clergy occasioned some delay; but eventually the desires of James V. were complied with, and he was authorised to tax the Scottish bishops and heads of religious houses in the sum of ten thousand golden

[1] Balfour's Annals, v. ii. 128. [2] Burnet's Own Times, p. 23.

ducats of the chamber, for the maintenance of the senators, of whom, the bull expressly provided, that one half should be ecclesiastical dignitaries. Charles, therefore, placed some of the bishops on the bench and in the Court of Exchequer; and he instituted a Commission, consisting of the two archbishops, the bishops of Ross and Dunblane, and some noblemen, to try "grievances;" that, as he said, "all such of our subjects as complain upon any heavy grievances may have the means in justice to be relieved." This court was very unpopular, and Balfour says, "it vanished without so much as once meeting[1]." On the 12th of July, the king wrote to his privy council, commanding them to give place and precedence to the archbishop of St. Andrews before the lord chancellor and all others[2].

Under the same date the bishop of Ross was sent down from court, charged to declare to his brethren, the archbishops and bishops, that it was the king's will that those of the clergy who still scrupled to fulfil the Perth articles should be tolerated till they could be induced to comply, provided that they would abstain from publicly impugning the king's authority, the canons and government of the church, and from persuading others from yielding obedience to them: that the banished ministers be allowed to return and be restored to their parishes and churches; but that all who have been ordained since the adoption of the Perth articles, be made to obey and practice them under pain of censure: and that the bishops be compelled to see these articles under the aforesaid limitations duly enforced[3].

1627.—At a meeting of the bishops and some of the clergy in the end of the preceding year, to consult how to check the increase of popery, which was beginning to cause some alarm, they sent the bishops of Ross and Moray to court, to entreat his majesty to take some measures for the suppression of that heresy. It does not appear with what success their deputation was attended; but on their return the presbyteries were instructed to send one or two of their number to meet and confer with the bishops, who had been at court. The two archbishops were not present at this conference. The disaffected ministers protested against this meeting being either called or considered a General Assembly, but only a conference. This was readily granted, and a petition to his majesty was agreed on: the conforming clergy chose the bishop of Ross, and the non-conformists Mr. Robert Scott, minister of Glasgow, to present it;

[1] Balfour's Annals, ii. 131.—Stevenson, 107. [2] Balfour's Annals, ii. 141.
[3] Balfour's Annals, ii. 131.

and its tenor was as follows,—1. To deal with his majesty for a lawful maintenance for the ministry, and for the plantation of kirks. 2. For a lawful General Assembly. 3. That a petition be presented for the suffering ministers, whether banished, deposed, or confined; that the sentences may be taken off and they restored to their places, and be admitted members of the Assembly, if they shall be chosen by their presbyteries. 4. That none be troubled in their ministry for non-conformity, nor intrants to the ministry with subscription until that Assembly be called. 5. That any brother, presbytery, or society, desirous to send up any petition or grievance to his majesty, shall deliver the same to these commissioners[1].

This conference was disapproved of by the archbishop and other bishops who had not been present, and there was nothing farther done. After that the tithe commissioners met, and summoned some of the interested parties before them; but the lay impropriators taking alarm for their own interests, sent the lairds of Balcomy and Ley to represent their affairs to the king; with whom they were so far successful, that on their return in April they brought letters from his majesty, recommending the commissioners to relieve the gentry as much as possible in the valuation and the composition to be paid for their tithes. This order was unsatisfactory to the clergy, and the commissioners desired them to try the state of the tithes in each parish, with the assistance of some of their parishioners, and to make a regular report to them. Reports were accordingly made in the months of May and June, which were approved of; but the king resolved that the holders should have their own tithes at a reasonable rate, and all were ordained to submit accordingly to the commissioners[2]. Prosecutions were successively commenced against those who refused to accept the king's offer and to submit to his arbitration. The weakest and least refractory were first selected, who being separately prosecuted, and having no means of combination, were obliged, although reluctantly, to submit, fearing the consequences of a legal judgment.

The disaffected ministers, and their more crafty and evil-designing allies the lay-impropriators, eagerly deluded the people with a false report, that the act of revocation was only a pretext for repealing all the acts against popery. During the prevalence of this popular delusion, Charles sent the earl of Annandale and the lord Maxwell as commissioners to hold a parliament, with secret instructions to the lord Maxwell to

[1] Stevenson's Church and State, 108. [2] Ibid. 108-109.

use his most strenuous endeavours to procure the passing of an act of revocation. This measure excited a permanent discontent among the nobility, and induced them to make common cause with the presbyterian party, in opposition to the crown, and in their hatred of the episcopal church, on whose spoils they had enriched themselves. Excited by their misrepresentations, the citizens of Edinburgh attacked the lord Maxwell's carriage, which he had sent on before to Dalkeith, demolished it, and killed the horses, and savagely expressed their regret that they had it not in their power to have served his lordship in the same way. The presbyterian party, at the instigation of their noble allies, spread an alarm that it was the king's intention to revoke all the acts against the Roman Catholics, and to re-establish the church of Rome; which, as they expected and designed, quickly excited an uproar among the people, and the commissioners found it unsafe to enter on the business of the revocation. Instead of which, a commission was issued under the great seal for receiving the surrender of superiorities and tithes within the kingdom at his majesty's pleasure. The solicitor-general, sir Archibald Aitchison, suggested to Charles, "that the act of revocation had been represented by those that were likely to be sufferers under it, as principally intended to revoke all former acts for suppressing popery and settling the reformed religion, and therefore it would not be safe to proceed further in it; but that a commission might be issued, under the great seal of Scotland, for taking the surrendries of all such superiorities and tithes within the kingdom, at his majesty's pleasure, and that such as refused to submit might be impleaded one by one, beginning with such of the occupants as might be thought most willing to yield, or least able to contend: in which case he could assure his majesty, that having the laws on his side, the courts of justice must and would pass judgment for him." This proposal was agreed to, and a commission of surrendry accordingly passed the great seal on the 26th of June of this year[1].

His majesty wrote to the privy council, to show them that he was credibly informed of the insolent conduct of papists, and of the public scandal and offence that they gave; and, in consequence, that he commanded them to cause the High Commission Court to take precise order with all papists, but particularly with seminary priests and jesuits, who give public scandal, and bring religion into contempt. He also commanded his privy council to assist the commissioners with

[1] Cited in Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 287.

their whole power and authority; but withal, to deal leniently with such papists as lived in conformity with the laws, and gave no public scandal; "our intention being rather to save their souls than to ruin their estates[1]."

1628.—At Easter this year the disaffected presbyterian party excited a great deal of discontent among the people, on account of the article which enjoined kneeling at the communion. Some meetings were held, and a petition was drawn up to the king, setting forth the evils which distracted the church, by the diversity of opinion and practice on this head, of which they themselves had been originally the cause, and which they still kept up, out of an obstinate spirit of resistance to lawful authority; which, indeed, is their fundamental principle. Things which are in themselves indifferent, cease to be so when they are commanded by lawful authority; and in this case there was not only the imposition by lawful authority, but there was in addition the invariable usage of the whole christian church since the days of the apostles. This petition, therefore, when presented, was very displeasing to the king, who not only rejected it, but wrote to the archbishop of St. Andrews to censure the offenders. It is very singular, that men who made such professions of love for civil and religious liberty, and of detestation of regal tyranny, should have excited the king to commit an act of despotism utterly destructive to liberty, by petitioning him to *dispense with the laws*, an error which was made one of the main charges against his son James. "Having received a letter," he said, "from the ministers of Edinburgh, wherein they have desired us to give way for exempting their petitioners from kneeling in taking the sacrament, contrary to an act of parliament; in that case we cannot but be exceedingly offended, that they durst presume to move us against that course that was so warrantably done, and that without your knowledge, who are entrusted in a charge over them. Therefore our special pleasure is, that you convene these persons before you, and having tried the truth of this business, and the chief authors thereof, that ye inflict such condign punishment as may, by this example, make others forbear to do the like hereafter; and continue your best endeavours to settle that order which was formerly established, whereby ye shall do us most acceptable service."

The non-conformists had vowed at their meeting, that if the king denied their petition, they would resign their benefices, and suffer a voluntary martyrdom. But instead of this,

[1] Balfour's Annals, ii. 155.

they deprived their flocks of the communion, and "all of them *forgot* to resign their offices, as they had promised, and some of them were restless till they had given satisfaction to the archbishop[1]." These are the fruits of the "holy discipline," selfish murmurings, emulations and wrath, strifes and seditions, and depriving the people of the *means of grace*, through obstinacy and a contentious spirit. Along with these sinful passions the presbyterians also showed their strong propensity to Erastianism, by applying to the crown to alter ecclesiastical laws by the king's own sole authority. Now the same party began to exclaim against Arminianism, and artfully associated these opinions with popery, so as more readily to alarm and affect the multitude. It does not follow that Arminius was right in all his points, because he opposed the dogmas of Calvin; yet, on that account, it has been the constant tactic of the Calvinists to call those men Arminians who hold the sober and scriptural doctrines of the Church of England, which is an utter absurdity, inasmuch as her doctrines were published in her authorised formularies long before Arminius was born. The divinity professors in the Scottish universities were also roundly charged with having planted "this weed," in order, as it is alleged, to ingratiate themselves with bishop Laud, which is likewise a vile calumny.

The non-conformists held one of their fasts on the two last *Sundays* of May and upon the intervening Wednesday, on account of "the innovations made upon the discipline and worship of our church, the prosecuting of many honest ministers for their opposition to these innovations." The divisions in the church presented a favourable occasion to the Romish party, which they improved to their own advantage, and mass was publicly celebrated in several places of the kingdom. The king's intention of visiting his native kingdom, in July, was postponed at the entreaty of his privy council, on account of the state of the royal residences, which could not be put in readiness for his reception.

On the 17th of August, Dr. John Leslie was consecrated bishop of the Isles, as successor to Dr. Thomas Knox, who died in 1626. Dr. Leslie was one of the most accomplished men of the age. He was so great a linguist, that he spoke with ease most of the modern languages of Europe, and Latin with so much fluency, that it was said of him in Spain, "*Solus Lesleius Latine loquitur*,—Leslie is the only man who can speak Latin."

[1] Stevenson's Church and State, p. 111.

1629.—The church seems to have enjoyed some degree of external calm this year; but the holders of church property were secretly using their influence to inflame the minds of the people against the royal and episcopal powers. The king wrote again to the privy council, and appointed the archbishop of St. Andrews to take precedence of the lord chancellor in the council and in public. This gave deep offence to his lordship, and he returned for answer, "that never a stoned priest in Scotland should set a foot before him so long as his blood was hot;" and unfortunately it also increased the irritation of the nobility against the episcopal order[1]. On the 13th of May the queen gave birth to a son, who being weak and sickly, was immediately baptized by the name of Charles. He died the same day at Greenwich, and the following day he was solemnly interred at Westminster[2].

1630.—The most malicious reports were spread by the interested parties, of the king's intention to force "the whole order of the church of England" upon the Scottish church. It was the desire both of James and Charles that there should be an uniform order observed throughout the three kingdoms; but the spirit of obstinate resistance to authority which Melville had introduced and fostered, had hitherto disappointed their wishes. It is singular that all their power and authority was unable to effect an uniformity which was cheerfully and spontaneously complied with after the revolution had relieved the church from presbyterian agitation, and threw her into the fire of persecution. Balfour gives a long letter from Mr. Struthers, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, to the earl of Airth, to be communicated to the king, wherein he lays out all the grievances of the party against the rites and ceremonies of the church of England. He complains also of the "novations" in religion, and of two wounds under which the Scottish church, he said, lay groaning; viz. "1st, the *erection of bishops*, the other of *geniculation;* but if a third be inflicted, there is no appearance but of a dissipation of the church. In the first, men were only on-lookers on the bishop's state; the second touched them more in celebration of the holy sacrament, but yet left it arbitrary to them; but this third will be greater, because in the whole body of public worship they shall be forced to suffer novelties." Now, this zealous opposer of episcopacy and of the settlement of the church's rites and ceremonies in a decent and orderly way, was formerly a strenuous *supporter* of both of these when it was his *interest* so to be; for Balfour says, he

[1] Balfour's Annals, ii. 172. [2] Ibid. 176.

was "a conformitan (as then named); howbeit, he was formerly content to *accept of a bishopric*, yet now would rather quit the same, ere he would embrace these ceremonies he perceived were a broaching to be introduced in the church and state[1]."

On the 29th of May, THE PRINCE OF WALES was born at St. James's, between ten and eleven o'clock in the forenoon. The following day, being Sunday, the king, with the lords of his privy council, went in state to St. Paul's, at eight o'clock, A.M., and were received at the great west door by the bishop and prebends, where he returned thanks, and a solemn *Te Deum* was sung. The lyon-king-at-arms, who happened then to be at court, was sent down post to inform the Scottish privy council, and he arrived on the 1st of June, where the news were received with every demonstration of joy. The prince of Wales was baptized by the name of CHARLES, on the 27th of June, with great state and solemnity. On this occasion the Lord Mayor and sir Hineage Finche, recorder of London, presented the king with a cup of gold valued at £1000. James, duke of Lennox, represented Louis XIII. and James, marquis of Hamilton, the prince Elector Palatine, the godfathers; and the duchess of Richmond stood for the queen mother of France, who was the godmother[2].

Stevenson draws an exceedingly gloomy picture of the state of the presbyterians at this period; and he construes their discontent and opposition to authority into severe hardships and persecution. Yet, says he, "amidst all these dark and ill-boding dispensations to the church, there were still left some bright spots in her cloud; then did a large measure of the Spirit convincingly follow the ministry of the word in several places of this kingdom. Besides those which took place on occasion of the frequent fasts observed among presbyterians at this time, there are these following instances . . . . The first is that wonderful pouring forth of the Spirit in the conversion of many souls by the ministry of the famous MR. JOHN LIVINGSTON, on occasion of a communion at the kirk of Shotts, upon the 21st of June this year. . . . At this time there was so convincing an *appearance of God* and down-pouring of the Spirit, even in an extraordinary way, that did follow the ordinances, especially the sermon on the Monday, June 21st, with a strange unusual motion on the hearers, who, in a great multitude, were there convened of diverse ranks, that it was known, which I can speak on sure grounds, near five hundred had at that time a discernible change wrought on them, of whom

[1] Balfour's Annals, ii. 181-182. [2] Ibid. 178.

most proved lively christians afterwards." And again, there was another extraordinary outpouring at Stewarton, which was called in ridicule the *Stewarton sickness*, because the votaries of this fanaticism fell down as in a swoon, and were carried in that state out of church. "Satan, indeed, endeavoured to bring a reproach on this good work, by some *excesses* committed, both in time of sermon and in families, by several who were seemingly under serious concern[1]." And this will ever be the conclusion of enthusiasm and an overheated imagination, which mistakes their impulses for "outpourings of the Spirit." The *excesses* here spoken of have constantly accompanied the holy discipline, which was distinguished at these sacramental meetings by the spirit and practice of all uncleanness; a sure and certain sign that the discipline cannot be from God, for the devil of lust generally entered into them, as the devil of covetousness entered into Judas, and filled them full of the works of the flesh.

On the 28th and 29th of July, there was a convention of the estates held in Holyrood House, for raising a tax, at which the presbyterian party, agreeable to the system which they had adopted, presented a petition praying for a redress of their grievances, and which was supported by the noble impropriators. It was referred to the next parliament, which would soon be called, as a more proper channel through which to bring their complaints under the notice of his majesty. The ill success of their former petition did not deter the lord Balmerino from presenting another containing an entirely new grievance, which they had now discovered existed in the oaths of supremacy and canonical obedience to the bishops. This also met with the rejection which they no doubt anticipated; but the system of presenting petitions against the legal and long-standing customs of the church had the designed effect of keeping the unthinking people in a constant agitation[2].

[1] Stevenson's Church and State, i. 53, 56.

[2] Ibid. p. 122.

I, *A. B.*, nominated and appointed to the church of ———, utterly testify and declare, in my conscience, that the right excellent, right high and mighty prince, Charles I., by the grace of God king of Scots, is the only supreme governor of this realm, as well in things temporal as in the conservation and purgation of religion. And that no foreign prince, &c.; and therefore I utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities, and authorities, and promise that from this time forth I shall and will bear faith and true allegiance to his highness, his heirs and lawful successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, privileges, pre-eminences, and authorities, granted and belonging to his highness, his heirs and lawful successors, or united and annexed to his royal crown. And further, I confess to have and hold the said church and possession of the same under God, only of his majesty and crown royal of this

1631.—The agitation among the presbyterians increased; but their young aspirants found themselves entirely shut out by the oaths of supremacy and canonical obedience, which were altogether fatal to their designs. In consequence many went over to the north of Ireland, where they were ordained in their own way, and some of them settled there, and assisted to agitate that kingdom.

On Friday, the 4th of November, the LADY MARY was born at St. James's, between five and six o'clock in the morning. She was afterwards PRINCESS OF ORANGE, and the mother of that prince who ascended her brother's throne in 1688[1].

1632.—Of this year Stevenson says, "we had little else but famine, death, preferment of bishops, and intestine commotions," caused by the impropriators of tithes, who made use of the discontented presbyterians to rouse the prejudices of the ignorant vulgar, which soon after ended in bloodshed and open rebellion.

About the first of November, James Law, archbishop of Glasgow, departed this life; and on the 8th he was interred in

realm: and for the said possession, I do homage presently to his majesty, his heirs and lawful successors, and shall be faithful and true. So help me

Oath of Canonical Obedience.

I, *A. B.*, now admitted to the kirk of *C.*, promise and swear to *E. F.*, bishop of that diocese, obedience, and to his successors, in all lawful things. So help me

I, *A. B.*, to be admitted to the ministry of the kirk of *C.*, by thir presents solemnly swear and faithfully promise to observe and fulfil the articles and conditions following:—

That I shall be leil and true to our most gracious sovereign the king's majesty, and his highness' successors, and to my power shall maintain his highness' right and prerogative in causes ecclesiastical.

That I shall be obedient to my ordinary the bishop of *D.*, and to all other my superiors in the church, speak of them reverently, and in all my public and private prayers commend them and their estate to God's merciful protection.

That I shall in all places by conference maintain the present government of the church and jurisdiction episcopal; and shall by reading be careful to inform myself of the true and lawful grounds thereof, to the end I may stand for it against the adversaries of the same.

That I shall be diligent to my power in the duties of my calling, and not desert therefrom without license of my ordinary the bishop of *D.*

That I shall study to advance the state of the church in general, and particularly the estate of the church of *C.* whereto I am to be received, in all profits and commodities that possibly I can.

And lastly, that I shall live a peaceable minister in the church, subjecting myself to the orders that therein are or shall be established, and by all means that I can use, to procure others to the due reverence of the same. Which things, if I shall contravene (as God forbid), I am content upon trial and cognition taken by my said ordinary, without all reclamation or gainsaying, to be deprived of my ministry, and to be repute [illegible] perpetual and infamous for ever. In witness, &c.

[1] Balfour's Annals, ii. 121.

St. Mungo's cathedral at Glasgow. "He was esteemed a man of good learning, and had a grave and venerable aspect. He left behind him a commentary upon several places of Scripture, which give a good specimen of his knowledge both in the fathers and in the history of the church." This prelate completed the leaden roof of his cathedral. His second lady, Marion Boyle, of the family of Kelburn, now earls of Glasgow, erected a very handsome monument over his grave. He was succeeded by Patrick Lindsay, bishop of Ross, who had been consecrated by archbishop Spottiswood on the 15th of December, 1613[1].

On the 2d of December, king Charles was seized slightly with small-pox; but the disease not being violent, his strength and vigour soon restored him to health[2].

1633.—In this discontented state of the kingdom, Charles determined on visiting his native country, which he had never seen since he left it at two years of age. His progress through England was magnificent, and his reception in Scotland affectionate and loyal. The Scottish nobility vied with the English peers in the most profuse hospitality, which they carried to such excess, that Clarendon ascribes a partial cause of their future rebellion to the ruinous waste and extravagance then practised. On the 15th of June, he made a triumphal entry into Edinburgh by the West Port, "and marching through the city to his palace of Holyrood House, for many ages this kingdom had not seen a more glorious and stately entry, the streets being all railed and sanded; the chief places where he passed were set out with stately triumphal arches, obelisks, pictures, artificial fountains, adorned with choice music, and divers other costly shows; . . . . . then came the king's majesty, riding on a Barbary, with an exceeding rich caparison and foot-cloth of crimson velvet, embroidered with gold and oriental pearls, the bosses of bridle, crupper, and tye, being richly set with emeralds, rubies, and diamonds, and on his head a panache of red and white plumes[3]."

On the 17th of June, the king was feasted in the castle by the earl of Mar; and on the following day he went in state from the castle to the chapel royal, Holyrood House. Six noblemen bore the canopy of state: "ROTHES, the father of the future covenant, carried the sceptre; and LORD LORN, the deeper and more deadly promoter of the rebellion, assisted to bear the train. The factious insolency of the Scottish nobles, which

[1] Balfour's Annals, ii. 192.—Keith's Cat. 264. [2] Balfour.
[3] Balfour's Annals, ii. 193—198.

Charles had experienced in England, he now met with in more dangerous and personal collision at home." As an act of grace at his coronation, the king created Hay, of Dupplin, earl of Kinnoul; but although he had given the primate precedency of all other subjects, yet Kinnoul would not yield it to the archbishop, even on that occasion and at the request of the king. "Thus," says Mr. Napier, "even the royal procession, which to the eyes of all Scotland betokened gaiety and gladness, was to the devoted monarch replete with vexation and bitterness[1]." "And because this was the most glorious and magnificent coronation that ever was seen in this kingdom, and the first king of Great Britain that ever was crowned in Scotland, to behold these triumphs and ceremonies many strangers of great quality resorted hither from divers countries[2]."

The coronation was performed by the archbishop of St. Andrews, assisted by the bishops of Ross and Moray. In the coronation oath, the following clause particularly bound Charles to the maintenance of the church *as then established.* The archbishop asked his majesty—

"Sire,—we also beseech you to grant and preserve to us of the clergy, and to the church committed to our charge, all canonical privileges; and that you will defend and protect us in this your kingdom, as every good king ought to defend his bishops and the church under their government."

The king answered,—"With a willing heart I grant the same, and promise to maintain you, and every one of you, with all the churches committed to your charge, in your haill rights and privileges, according to law and justice."

Then the king, rising from his chair, went to the communion table, where, in sight of all the people, he laid his hands on the Bible, and took his oath, saying, "All the things which before I have promised, I shall observe and keep. So help me God, and by the contents of this book."

Stevenson asserts that David Lindsay, bishop of Brechin, preached; but Heylin states that DR. LAUD, bishop of London, who was in the king's suite, preached on this occasion. The people were taught by the sincerer sort to esteem the decent religious ceremonies used at the coronation as the introduction of the Romish mass, and to ascribe the imposition as the work of Dr. Laud: "a man," says the late bishop Walker, "whom every true son of the church of England is bound to hold in veneration, both as a man, a christian, and a minister." Much abuse has been heaped on that most excellent prelate for displacing

[1] Montrose and the Covenanters, i. 91, 92. [2] Balfour's Annals, ii. 199.

the archbishop of Glasgow, who appeared in his place, at the king's left hand at the coronation, in his ordinary dress, without his robes, which, as it marked a leaning in the archbishop towards the puritan faction, was taken up by them as a fit subject of clamour against bishop Laud. Yet all the archbishop's compliances with that faction did not save him from their fury five years afterwards, when he met the same fate and the same obloquy as the other bishops. But the most trivial circumstance was seized with avidity by the presbyterians to inflame the uncharitable passions of the mob, and make them spy popery in the most trivial accidents.

On June the 20th the parliament met, and granted the king the largest subsidy that had ever been voted to any of his predecessors. After which, the lords of the articles presented two acts; the one entitled, "An act anent his majesty's royal prerogative, and apparel of kirkmen;" the other, "An act of ratification of the acts touching religion[1]." Great opposition was made to this act by the earl of Rothes, who desired the acts might be divided; but the king said it was now one act, and he must either vote for it or against it. Those attached to the presbyterian party were displeased at having the act for the apparel of kirkmen joined to the prerogative, being alarmed lest, under its cover, the king should introduce the surplice. With the view of making himself popular with the presbyterians, the earl of Rothes said he was for the prerogative as much as any man, but that addition was contrary to the liberties of the church, and he thought no determination ought to be made without their being heard; and he voted, not content. The clerk of the register, who gathered and declared the votes, found it was carried in the affirmative[2]. To make the observation of these two acts the more binding on the subjects, the king's general revocation was ratified in parliament, and which he only intended as a *brutum fulmen*, to awe those who might attempt any opposition to these acts. "But it proved in the end a forcible rope to draw the affections of the subjects from the prince, and in effect they were the very ground-stones of all the mischiefs that hath since followed[3]."

The lords ROTHES and LOUDON were the leaders of a very dangerous rising faction, that included the whole presbyterian party, and which acted with the greatest hypocrisy. "A third bewraying of their factious humour," says the king, "appeared clearly at our last being in that our kingdom, and immo-

[1] Rushworth, 182. [2] Clarendon, 79.—Cruikshanks, i. 24.
[3] Balfour's Annals, ii. p. 200.

diately after our departure from thence. For some six years ago, having a great desire to visit that our native kingdom, and being willing to cheer and comfort our subjects there with our presence, and honour them with our personal coronation, all which they did most humbly and heartily solicit us for, by their earnest and affectionate supplications we undertook a journey to them, and according to our expectation were most joyfully received by them; but immediately before, and at the sitting down of our parliament, we quickly found that the very same persons who since were the contrivers of, and still continue the sticklers for, their now pretended covenant, began to have secret meetings, and in their private consultations did vent their dislike of our innocent revocation, and our most beneficial commission of surrenders: but knowing that these two could gain them no party, then they begun to suggest great fears that many and dangerous innovations of religion were to be attempted in this present parliament: not that they themselves thought so, but because they knew that either that or nothing would soil with suspicious jealousy, or interrupt and relax the present joy and contentment which did overflow in our subjects' hearts, and appeared in their hearty expressions for our presence among them.

"But we readily confuted all these suspicious surmises; for except an act which gave us power to appoint such vestures for churchmen which we should hold to be most decent, *nothing concerning religion was either propounded or passed* in this parliament, but that which every king doth usually, in that and all other christian kingdoms, pass at their first parliament—*viz.* an act of ratification of all other acts heretofore made, and then standing in force, concerning the religion presently professed and established, and concerning the church, her liberties and privileges: which act being *an act of course*, though it passed by most voices, yet was it *dissented from*, to our great admiration, by the voices of many of those who are now the *principal pillars of their covenant*: which made all men begin to suspect, that sure there was some great distemper of heat at the heart, when it boiled over so at their lips, by their unnecessary and unprofitable denying of assent to the laws concerning the religion and church already established; this first act passing more for form and honour of religion than for any use or necessity of it, all the former laws still standing in force and vigour, without the need of any new ratification[1]."

[1] Large Declaration concerning the late Tumults in Scotland, pp. 10, 11.

A base calumny was circulated against the king, that he had caused the clerk-register to declare the act passed, when, in fact, they said it was rejected. The king condescended to clear himself of this malicious assertion, and his account is corroborated by all other historians except bishop Burnet, who gives it a turn unfavourable to the king. Charles says, that so many made suit for honours, that it was impossible to comply with their demands, "without the prostitution of honour to a just and open contempt . . . . . and many of those who were *then* passed by, and are *now* principal covenanters, seeing others advanced to degrees of honour above themselves, began then presently to mutter, but not to mutiny until we were gone from them. But scarcely were we well returned into England, when the discontent of these men resolved itself into a *plain sedition;* for thence they had the impudence to give it out, that voices were bought and packed in the late parliament; nay, that the voices were not truly numbered, but that some acts were passed without plurality of suffrages: a *calumny so foul and black*, as that they themselves did know it to be false; for had there been the least suspicion of truth in it, they might have made trial thereof by surveying their own papers and the papers of many hundreds present, who took notes of the number of voices which were given, either by assenting to or dissenting from the several acts read and proposed; by which papers, if they had found but the weakest ground for this their strong but false report, we have no reason to think that either their mercy or modesty was such that they would have forborne the calling of the clerk of our register in question for it; it being as our chancellor's office to ask the voices, so our clerk of register's office to take them and record them, and according to his own and his clerk's notes, who assist him, to pronounce the act passed or stopped. In which it is impossible that he should deal but with sincerity; for else the notes taken by most of the auditors, being a present and powerful conviction of his false dealing, must presently transmit him to the highest censure and punishment[1]."

Balfour found it necessary, he says, to make a digression, "for clearing *the fountain and spring* from whence all the succeeding great alterations and changes both of church and state did seem to flow (the vulgar being made believe so) as a corollary of the emergents of this year, and to present to posterity some grievances given in by some ministers, and presented to the clerk of register, Sir John Hay, before the sitting

[1] Large Declaration, pp. 11, 12.

down of the parliament." On the king's arrival, Thomas Hogg, one of the ministers in the presbyterian interest, was pitched upon by the factious nobility and the discontented ministers, to present a petition to the clerk-register, entitled, "Grievances and petitions concerning the disordered estate of the reformed kirk within the realm of Scotland, presented upon the 28th of May, 1633, by Mr. Thomas Hogg, minister of the Evangel, to be presented by him to such as ought, according to the order appointed, to consider them, that thereafter they may be presented to his majesty and estates which were to be assembled at the ensuing parliament." As Sir John Hay declined to present this petition to his majesty, Mr. Hogg presented it himself to the king at Dalkeith, the day previous to his majesty's public entry into the capital. "His majesty read the petition all over, without bewraying any displeasure at it; yet, after some conference with the earl of Morton, the earl came to Mr. Hogg, and asked his name, and said, he wished the petitioners had chosen another place than his house for presenting their application: from which the petitioners inferred that their design was no way acceptable to his majesty, and feared their hopes would be frustrated, and their desires rejected, which they soon found to be the case: their grievances were suppressed, and they never heard more of them, either among the lords of the articles, or in open parliament[1]."

But this petition was not to be allowed to sink into oblivion. William Haig, the solicitor-general, prepared another petition upon the basis of Hogg's, which had been rejected. "This precious *egg of sedition* the solicitor privately conveyed to Lord Balmerino, for incubation[2]." This nobleman was the "treacherous son of a treacherous father," who was condemned to suffer death for stealing the royal sign-manual to a state paper, for his own private purposes of favouring popery, but who was pardoned by king James. The son inherited his father's treachery, and withal a spirit of revenge which was the national vice of the time; consequently, he entered heartily into all the seditious intrigues which were then hatching. Haig submitted this petition to Balmerino, which Mr. Napier justly calls "a scheme of a revolution," and who shewed it to lord Rothes, but who thought it not fit to be presented to his majesty. "It is not surprising that even their effrontery, who at the very time were forcing themselves upon

[1] Stevenson's Church and State, p. 137.
[2] Napier's Montrose and the Covenanters, i. 102.

the king in his progresses, was unequal to the task of presenting this petition; for a more purely insulting document, if offered to the king, and, if circulated among the people, a more insidiously seditious one, could not have been framed. It began by accusing the king of asserting in the recent parliament a secret power to innovate the order and government long continued in the reformed church of Scotland. It referred to the known wish of Charles to have a liturgy prepared for Scotland, as 'reports of allowance given in England for printing *books of popery*,'—it presumed to 'suspect a snare in the subtle junction' of the act of churchmen's apparel with that of the prerogative,—to call it 'a sophistical artifice,' and to add most insultingly, 'which blessed king James would never have confounded,'—it complained of the ministers' *grievances*, and, finally, the whole drift and modest purpose of this petition, full of such impertinencies, mixed up with the most contradictory expressions of loyalty and humility, amounted to this—that Charles should give up the established church to the meaner model of a Scotch faction thirsting for democratic power. This ingenious scheme, concocted by a single lawyer out of some *conferences* he had held with sundry of a disappointed minority in parliament, was entitled 'the humble supplication of a great number of the nobility and other commissioners in the late parliament.' The real intention never could have been to present this to his majesty, at least with any other view than that of insulting and enraging him. It must have been conceived with the covert view of agitating Scotland against the king. It was to pass for the suppressed voice of a loyal but a subjugated people against a tyrannical monarch and papistical clergy; and if the ministers joined heartily in the scheme, the nation, it was foreseen, would be *revolutionised from the pulpits*. In short, this insidious paper involved one of the most dangerous instances of the statutory crime of leasing-making that could well be imagined[1]."

Rothes undertook to present this insulting petition, but which the king peremptorily refused to receive; and at the same time taxed Rothes with his disingenuous conduct; but he cleared himself of the charge, and took great credit to himself for having suppressed all improper petitions. And then, says Mr. Napier, "with ludicrous effrontery, added, that he had one of these *suppressed* petitions in his pocket, 'if your majesty would be pleased to look upon it.'" But the king replied, "No more of this, my lord, I command you," and nothing

[1] Napier's Montrose and Covenanters, i. 102, 103. [2] Ibid. 104.

farther was heard of it till the following year, when lord Balmerino was prosecuted for leasing-making[1].

The first clause of this petition struck directly at the foundation of the church, and, if it had been received, would have introduced the small end of the wedge for her entire subversion: "Albeit vote in parliament was not absolutely granted to ministers provided to prelacies, but only upon such conditions as his highness, of happy memory, and the general assemblies of the kirk should agree upon . . . ." some ministers, notwithstanding, have been and are admitted to vote in parliament, in name of the kirk, as absolutely as if the act of parliament did contain no such reference . . . . . Therefore our humble supplication is, that the execution of the acts of parliament, of matters belonging to the kirk, to which they have voted in name of the kirk, without any authority or allowance of the General Assembly of the kirk, be suspended till that the kirk be heard; and that in time coming ministers have no otherwise vote of parliament but according to the provision of the act of parliament, and the order of their entry to the office of that commissionary and limitation aforesaid agreed on as said is."

The second clause asserted the supremacy of the democratical part of the General Assembly over the bishops, and also over the civil government, as it pleaded for "the subjection of bishops in all things concerning their life, conversation, office, and benefice, to the censure of the General Assembly; and the censure of the bishops in case they stay the censure of excommunication." This was precisely the power which the Assembly actually assumed to themselves in the year 1638; and Mr. Napier very justly calls this petition "a shadow of the coming covenant."

The sincere affection with which the people had at first welcomed the king, by the vile arts of Rothes and the presbyterian party, was now turned into distrust and hatred. The people were now led to believe that the king entertained the most despotic intentions; and, along with the surplice, that he intended to introduce the mass. Charles observed this sullen discontent of the people towards him, and expressing his surprise at the sudden reverse of popular favour, Leslie, bishop of the Isles, replied, "that the Scots were ready to-morrow to crucify him, whom yesterday they had saluted with hosannahs[2]."

Charles was conscientiously attached to the Anglican Catho-

[1] Guthry's Memoirs, p. 2.—Stevenson's Church and State, 139.
[2] Clarendon, i. 80.

lic church, and considered it the best adapted for the propagation and advancement of christianity, of any church in the world; while at the same time he was most firmly opposed to the Romish church; and no man better understood the motives of the separation of the papists from, and their animosity against, the reformed church. In Scotland the principle of papal insubordination and ambition "covered the whole nation, so that though there were bishops in name, the whole jurisdiction, and they themselves were upon the matter, subject to an Assembly which was purely presbyterian: no *form* of religion in practice, no liturgy, nor the least appearance of any beauty of holiness: the clergy, for the most part corrupted in their principles; at least none countenanced by the great men, or favoured by the people, but such, though it must be owned their universities, especially Aberdeen, flourished under many excellent scholars and very learned men[1]." The daily sacrifice had not been restored in any of the churches which were occupied as cathedrals, and only in the chapel royal had any decency of public worship been observed. In it the English liturgy was daily used with all the decencies of cathedral service; and the whole Scoto-Catholic church was happily disposed towards the use of a stated national liturgy at the period of king James's death. The establishment of the Anglican liturgy was firmly resolved on by king James, and lord Clarendon says, it was the principal object he had in view in his visit to his native kingdom[2]. Charles inherited his father's love of country and of religion, and resolved to unite his three kingdoms in one form of public devotions, and the completion of this pious resolution was one of the chief designs of his visit at this time.

For the accomplishment of this purpose, the king took Dr. Laud, then bishop of London, into Scotland with him, and made him a privy councillor. Dr. Laud preached in the chapel royal, and principally recommended the benefit of conformity and the reverend ceremonies of the church, "with all the marks of approbation imaginable;" and there is little doubt that had the king then proposed the introduction generally of the liturgy (for it was used in that particular chapel), and before the lay impropriators and the discontented presbyterians had time to organize an opposition, it would have been quietly adopted without any obstruction whatever. It is easy to frame confessions of faith which may be unexceptionable, but they do not prevent the utmost latitude of opinion in the formation

[1] Clarendon, i. p. 134-5. [2] Ibid. i. 135.

of extempore prayers, which being the work of each individual of the ministry, will present as many models as there are composers. In a stated liturgy, however, there is no latitude for private judgment; and the Anglican liturgy preserves the faith once delivered to the saints, and secures the benefit of an orthodox creed and prayers to the people, whatever may be the private opinions of the minister; a blessing for which we of the laity cannot be too thankful.

When Laud was consulted on the subject, his decided advice, strongly and repeatedly enforced, was to take the English liturgy, without any variation from it, that so the service book might pass through all his majesty's dominions[1]. To this some of the old experienced bishops said, "that in king James' time there had been a motion made for it, but that the presenting thereof was deferred on account of the partial opposition to the articles of Perth;—that they thought it neither safe nor fitting at that time to venture upon any farther innovations; and even yet they were not without apprehensions for the consequences[2]." Maxwell (bishop of Ross), Messrs. Sydserf, Mitchell, and some others, "pressed hard that it might be, assuring the king that there was no kind of danger in it; whereupon bishop Laud (who spake as he would have it), moved the king to declare it to be his will that there should be a liturgy in this church, his majesty commanded the bishops to go about the forming of it." When the report that a liturgy was to be compiled came to be generally known, it was applauded to the echo by both parties: the churchmen devoutly wishing such a consummation, while the presbyterian party thought that the attempt would startle the whole nation, alarm their prejudices, and be a convenient stalking-horse for embroiling the kingdom in a civil war, which might in the end be the means of exterminating episcopacy, and establishing presbytery.

The king was as jealous of the liberties and privileges of his native kingdom as any man, and he the more readily acquiesced in the arguments urged by the Scottish bishops for compiling one entirely new. The primate and some of the bishops alleged, "that the kingdom of Scotland generally had been long jealous that by the king's continued absence from them they should be by degrees reduced to be but as a province of England, and subject to their laws and government, to which they would never submit, nor would any man of honour, who loved the king best and respected England most, ever consent

[1] Life of Laud, in Ep. Mag.
[2] Guthry's Memoirs, pp. 16, 18.—Stevenson's Church and State, p. 115.

to bring that dishonour on his native country; and therefore it might look too like an arbitrary imposition from England, and a designed beginning of trampling upon all the laws and privileges of Scotland, if a form settled in parliament at Westminster should, without any alteration by ourselves, be tendered, though from the king's own hand, to be immediately submitted to, and observed in this independent church and kingdom. But if his majesty would give orders for preparing a liturgy, with a few alterations, it could easily be done, and in the meantime they would so dispose the minds of the people for its reception, that they should even desire it." Dr. Laud was exceedingly averse to the compilation of a new liturgy, or of making any alteration on the English Book of Common Prayer; especially as, in the Assembly at Aberdeen, in king James's time, there had been a motion made for the English liturgy, with a book of canons. But the king's national prejudices coinciding with those of the bishops, a new compilation was decided on; and the framing of such a composition as would most probably be acceptable to the people was committed to a select number of the bishops, who were both willing and able to undertake it, and who were commanded to submit the result of their labours to Dr. Laud, now promoted to the see of Canterbury, and Dr. Wren, bishop of Norwich,—a man particularly learned in the old liturgies of the Greek and Latin churches[1].

The compilation of the Scottish liturgy forms one of the gravest accusations against Laud, who, it is maintained, at length endeavoured to impose a liturgy of his own formation on the church of Scotland, carried much nearer to the popish model, as it is pretended, even than the English. This calumny, with all its connecting circumstances, Laud has himself triumphantly confuted, in the history of his "Troubles and Trial;" yet it is continued with unabated pertinacity both in England and in Scotland. Whatever be the merits of the work, the proof is incontestible that it was *not* the work of Laud,—that the compilation was Scottish,—and that the bishops by whom, and under whose authority, it was made, under the model generally of the English liturgy, were, in fact, jealous of English interference, and actually resisted that subserviency of which they were accused[2].

The presbyterian party heaped the most unbounded calumnies on archbishop Laud, and accused him of Arminianism and popery; to which he was strongly opposed. The former

[1] Clarendon, i. 138, 139.—Guthry, 18. [2] Life of Laud, in Scot. Ep. Mag.

is a term of reproach used by those holding Calvinistic sentiments, which most of the sincerer sort, and the English puritans generally, did. During the Marian persecution, many of the English clergy fled to Geneva, and there imbibed the senseless doctrine of rigid predestination, and thence imported it into England on their return in Elizabeth's reign. But "the English Cyprian," the great archbishop Laud, set himself to stop the torrent of this infection; and when he was chancellor of Oxford he turned the bent of the studies of the young Oxonians from these modern polemics, and the Dutch and German systems of divinity, to learn downwards from the first beginning of christianity, and to acquaint themselves with the *fathers* in their several ages, to their own times. This system enabled them better to judge of the novel disputes of the remonstrants, anti-remonstrants, supra and sublapsarians, which then tormented the protestants in Germany and Holland, and wherein the Scottish presbyterians likewise took part. And in consequence, these two famous universities of Oxford and Cambridge reap to this day the benefit of his pious instructions, which has given them that deserved reputation all over Europe for their great knowledge of antiquity and the primitive doctrine and discipline of the church,—teaching their scholars to derive their faith from its fountain and original, and not from the modern *dogmas* of either Luther or Calvin, but to go higher up than them[1]. The "sincerer sort" preached, that our Saviour died for the *elect* alone, and that all others had no interest in the sacrifice of the death of Christ[2]. The elect were those "godly" people, in their own eyes, who cherished the doctrine of "the eternal decree," whereby they condemned to outer darkness and gnashing of teeth, thousands and tens of thousands "of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues," who have done justice, loved mercy, and walked humbly before God in their several generations. When men were so puffed up with spiritual pride, it is not surprising that there should have been such uncharitable feelings towards their governors both in church and state, and so great a propensity to ascribe to them the most malignant motives in their most innocent and necessary acts of government.

1634.—Previous to this royal visit, Edinburgh had been a part of the diocese of St. Andrews; but Charles, willing to leave a monument of his piety and care for the church, erected Edinburgh into a bishopric, with a diocese extending from the Forth to Berwick, and appointed St. Giles's church for its

[1] Leslie's Works.

[2] Vide post, vol. ii. ch. on Westminster Assembly.

cathedral. Charles purchased some lands from the Lennox family, and settled them on the new see; and appointed Dr. William Forbes, a man second to none in private worth and public respectability, as the first bishop. Although he had been elected last year, yet it was the 28th of January before he was consecrated by archbishop Spottiswood, assisted by five other bishops, and in the presence of the archbishop of Glasgow, in the chapel royal. "For him," says Stevenson, "the king ordered the middle-wall in St. Giles's, which divided the little kirk from the greater, to be taken down, and that spacious building to be made a cathedral; and though this was depriving the city of so many of their churches, without making any provision for their relief, yet the obsequious council of the town gave orders to take down that partition; and it was done, to the great grief of the numerous inhabitants, who were already too poorly provided with churches." When a consultation was held, with regard to filling the see, the king said he had found a man who deserved to have had a bishopric erected for him. This pious and learned man did not long enjoy his preferment: he died the following year. "A person he was indued most eminently with all christian virtues, insomuch, that a very worthy man, Robert Burnet, lord Crimond, a judge of the session, said of our prelate, that he never saw him but he thought his heart was in heaven, and that he was never alone with him but he felt within himself a commentary on these words of the apostle,—'Did not our hearts burn within us while he talked with us, and opened to us the Scriptures?' Bishop Forbes had been twenty years in the exercise of the holy ministry before he was put into the see of Edinburgh, where he only appeared long enough to be known, but not long enough to do what might have been expected[1]."

"Edinburgh," says Clarendon, "though the metropolis of the kingdom, and the chief seat of the king's own residence, and the place where the council of state and courts of justice still remained, was but a borough town within the diocese of St. Andrews, and was governed in all church affairs by the city preachers, who, being chosen by the citizens from the time of Mr. Knox (who had a principal hand in the suppression of popery, with circumstances not very commendable to this day), had been the most turbulent and seditious ministers of confusion that could be found in the kingdom; of which king James had so sad experience after he came of age, as

[1] Keith's Catalogue, 61.

well as in his minority, that he would often say, that his access to the crown of England was the more valuable to him, as it redeemed him from subjection to the ill manners and insolent practices of these preachers, which he could never shake off before[1]." The king piously hoped that the erection of this bishopric would have been the means of restoring that love of order and submission to authority, which the factious, turbulent spirit of presbytery had completely extirpated from the minds of the people. In this good intention, however, that benevolent monarch was miserably disappointed; "so unfortunate was his majesty with that stubborn nation, that this was also looked upon as a general grievance, and must be thought to aim at no other end than tyranny and popery[2]."

Bishop Forbes being thus settled, he preached his first sermon as bishop of the new diocese on the first Sunday of February; and on Wednesday, the 5th of March, at the meeting of the presbytery of Edinburgh, their moderator read to them the bishop's charge.—"Beloved brethren,—It is not unknown to you what evil effects this long-continued schism brings forth in our kirk. All good christians are touched therewith, and so they should, but none more than you, whose calling in particular is to keep Christ's body from renting, and to build up the breaches thereof: Therefore, I desire you earnestly to think upon all good means for bringing back our peace; and being persuaded that, for the present, one of the most powerful means will be your conformity in your own persons to the laudable acts of our church in giving the sacrament, I require you, by thir presents, that ye all, who are the brethren of the exercise of Edinburgh, fail not to give the communion this next ensuing Pasch day (which will be the 6th April), every one of you in your own churches; and that ye take it yourselves upon your knees, giving so a good example to the people; and likewise, that ye minister the elements out of your own hands to every one of your flocks. I have desired the moderator to cause you to signify your consent thereto, by writ in a paper, which he shall present unto you, that ye put your names thereto, and report to me an answer within fourteen days, certifying you, that whose names I find not in the writ, I will take them as refusers to conform, and maintainers of our schism, against whom I shall be forced to proceed with ecclesiastical censures, seeing both ye had so long time to inform yourselves, and also many of you are bound to conformity by your promise and oath, at your entry into the ministry. I

[1] Clarendon, i. 136. [2] Heylin, p. 227.

desire you, likewise, whenever ye administer the sacrament after this, to admit none to it but those of your own parochin [parish], for the want of which there has been great profanation of that holy ministry; and for this cause I have willed you to give it altogether at one time; and I pray you see to this, for the breach of it I account as worthy of censure as the other. And last of all, I require you to preach of Jesus Christ his passion for our redemption, upon the Friday before Pasch, and that according to the canon of our church. So, expecting your answer, I commit you to God's best blessing and rest.

"GULIELMUS, Edinburgh."

The consent required in the above letter or charge was as follows:—"The within written letter being produced from the right reverend father in God, William, bishop of Edinburgh, we, the brethren of the presbytery thereof, undersubscribe, and oblige, and promise to obey the whole contents of the said letter, by thir presents, subscribed with our hands, this 5th of March, 1634[1]."

Ten of the clergy immediately signed the above form of consent; four requested time for consideration; but two, William Arthur, of the West Kirk, and James Thompson, of Collington, flatly refused to sign it, and, of course, to celebrate the anniversary of the death and resurrection of our Saviour. The other presbyteries in the diocese very generally refused obedience to their bishop's injunctions, who merely required the observance of an act of a General Assembly, which had been ratified by an act of parliament. Proclamation was made, that every one should conform to the articles agreed on in the Perth Assembly, and the bishops and conforming clergy used both arguments and persuasions to induce the sincerer sort, who were very obstinate, to comply. Yet, says Stevenson, "this prevailed only with time-servers, and those who depended on the court;" as if there could be no honest conscientious men but those of presbyterian principles who claimed exclusive possession of both religion and patriotism;—"only Satan's design was so far gained, that it produced greater division betwixt those who conformed and those who did not, made the breach still wider among church members, and laid a foundation for new rigour against the recusants[2]." The presbytery of Greenlaw, not content with simple disobedience to the bishop's letter, sent reasons subscribed by David Hume, their moderator, why they would not obey. In the conclusion of which they warned the bishop that the Lord's wrath would

[1] Stevenson's Church and State, 115, 116. [2] Ibid. 116, 117.

certainly overtake him, if he persisted in such vehement urging of ministers to do that whereof they had no warrant, they said, from God's word and their own consciences, but were sufficiently persuaded to the contrary[1].

Bishop Forbes did not live long to enjoy his elevation to the episcopate; for he died on the 12th of April, having ruptured a blood-vessel internally. He was one of the most learned and pious men of the age; but his enemies allege that his death was a judgment upon him, so uncharitable were they at that time, and of course he is vehemently accused of popery and Arminianism. Dr. Sydserf, dean of the chapel royal, preached his funeral sermon. Whoever taught catholic doctrines were accused of being followers of Arminius, and were always artfully classed with the votaries of the pope. The following quotation from Stevenson will shew the doctrines which were at that time taught in the church:—"In the Little Kirk (for as yet the congregation convened there) Mr. David Mitchel taught the principles of *universal redemption*, and supported them to his power; but Mr. Thomson did as openly *contradict* that doctrine in the Great Kirk, proving from Scripture, and the unanimous consent of ancient fathers, *that Christ suffered for the ELECT only*[2]."

Bishop Forbes was the author of a work published after his death, in 1658, intituled, *Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ controversiarum de justificatione, purgatorio, invocatione sanctorum et Christo mediatore, Eucharistia;* which his successor, the late primate Walker, says, "deserves to be better known than it is. But, alas! in his time and in this church, *modest and pacific considerations* were little regarded. The most learned and the most pious ministers were equally liable to insult, degradation, and persecution." During the time that he was principal of King's College, Aberdeen, he interspersed several arguments among his academical prelections, having a tendency to create *peace* among the contending parties of Christianity. He wrote also elaborate animadversions on the works of Cardinal Bellarmine; and after his death the MSS. were given to Dr. Barron to be arranged for publication. Dr. Barron was the object of persecution to the covenanters, and when he fell into trouble, and quitted the kingdom, bishop Forbes' MSS., and his own books and other property, were destroyed by them[3].

The see of Edinburgh was at first designed for Dr. Sydserf;

[1] Stevenson, p. 116. [2] Church and State, 116, 117.
[3] Bishop Walker's Life of Laud.

but Charles unfortunately changed his father's laudable custom of choosing one of three which were selected by the primate, and issued his *congé d'elire* for those recommended at court. He therefore translated David Lindsay from the see of Brechin to Edinburgh, on the 17th September, and Dr. Sydserf was preferred to the see of Brechin[1]. Keith does not give Sydserf in the succession of Brechin, but places Walter Whitford, of that ilk, as bishop there in this year, and who continued there till the revolution in 1688[2]. Stevenson, however, who was a contemporary, asserts, on the authority of certain historical collections, that Sydserf was preferred to Brechin, and consecrated in Edinburgh by archbishop Spottiswood, and that both he and bishop Lindsay were sumptuously entertained at dinner by the magistrates. Bishop Guthry also states, under this year, that Dr. Sydserf was "by the archbishop of Canterbury's moyen [means] made bishop of Brechin; . . . and when Sydserf was removed from Brechin to Galloway, Mr. Walter Whitford was made bishop of Brechin by the moyen of the earl of Stirling, the secretary for Scotland[3]."

It has been mentioned that a certain petition was suppressed, after a draught of it had been shewn to the king at Dalkeith by the earl of Rothes. One John Dunmure, a writer or solicitor, ["a common scrivener,"] at Dundee, having been with lord Balmerino at his house at Barnton, entered into conversation on the patriotic subject of the corruptions in church and state. Dunmure remarked, that it was a pity that they were not represented to the king; to which his lordship replied, "that they purposed to have done it, and had a petition signed for that end, which the earl of Rothes having shewn him, the king had commanded there should be no more of it, whereupon it was suppressed;" adding, "that as the framing of the petition had been committed to him, he had the original beside him, and would shew it to him." He produced it, and Dunmure took a copy of it when he retired to his chamber. On his return home,—Dunmure lodged at the house of Mr. Peter Hay, of Naughton,—the conversation again turned on the corruptions of the times. Mr. Hay, who "was very episcopal," expressed his surprise at Dunmure's deep knowledge of state affairs, and said he supposed he had been instructed by lord Balmerino. Dunmure answered, "You have guessed it, Balmerino is indeed my informer; and, moreover, showed me a petition," a

[1] Church and State, 147. [2] Keith's Catalogue.
[3] Guthry's Memoirs, 14.

copy of which he then showed to Hay, who contrived to get the petition from his guest, and, after some days, delivered it to the archbishop of St. Andrews, with an account of his conversation with Dunmure. The archbishop considered it necessary to acquaint the king with what was passing; when an order came from court to the council, to summon lord Balmerino and Dunmure before them for a breach of the 10th act of the tenth parliament of James VI., in which the spreading of lies of his majesty and his government, with the intention of alienating his subjects, is declared capital. Many copies of this petition were most industriously, though privately, circulated; and it was ascertained that it had been the means of exciting a great deal of opposition to the clerical habits, and the Articles of Perth, which otherwise might have been peaceably accommodated. Dunmure acknowledged the share which he had in the transaction, and lord Balmerino produced the original draught, but denied that he had given any permission to copy it. Dunmure was dismissed, but his lordship was committed a prisoner to the castle, and, in the month of June, was brought to trial before the earl of Erroll, lord high-constable, made lord justice-general for the time being, and a jury of his peers,—Haig, the original offender, having, in the meantime, made his escape to Holland. The trial was put off first till July, and afterwards till the 10th of November following, when Sir Robert Spottiswood, lord president of the college of justice, Sir John Hay, clerk-register, Sir James Learmonth, and another judge, were associated with the earl of Erroll; and four of the most eminent advocates at the bar were appointed his counsel. He was convicted of—1st, In keeping and concealing the said libel, contrary to acts of parliament and the laws of the land, and not revealing the same. 2d, In not apprehending the libeller, he being in his power, but furthering his escape. 3d, In being art and part in the said libel; as evidently appeared, by the production of a copy of the same interlined with the said lord's hand. Balmerino was condemned to death, but was first reprieved, and afterwards pardoned by the king: for whose mercy he made ample acknowledgments, and the most solemn promises of future exemplary loyalty, "which how he performed his actings in the troubles that ensued do testify[1]." The lord justice-general, in pronouncing sentence, declared, "that the said John, lord Balmerino, has therethrough incurred the pain of death contained in the acts of parliament, suspending always

[1] Guthry's Memoirs, p. 10, 11.—Balfour's Annals, ii. 220, 221.—Stevenson's Church and State, 117, 148.—Napier's Montrose and Covenanters.

the execution thereof until the time his majesty's will and pleasure be known and declared thereanent; to whose sacred majesty the manner, time, and place of the execution of the said sentence is remitted."

"To overawe," says Mr. Napier, "the justice of the king, or to rob him of the attribute of his mercy, the senseless mob had been agitated throughout to a pitch of audacity that now threatened the lives of both the judges and the jury. But the desire of Charles, at no time, was the death of a human being. Into this present prosecution his long-sufferance had been forced by the political iniquity of Scotland, and the selection made was indicative of a lofty sense of justice, but at the same time an extreme moderation in the desire of examples. Had he been the king to carry that example to extremity,—the justice of which must have been acknowledged by civilized Europe,—it could not have been his fate to have been led to the block by his own subjects, who usurped the sword of justice, and drove away mercy[1]."

George Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, died on the 4th of August, 1633; and, two days afterwards, the primacy was conferred on Dr. Laud, who succeeded in circumstances of peculiar difficulty and extreme danger. Abbot was weak, obstinate, and prejudiced; too easy and fond of popularity to enforce the rules of the church; and it has been said, "that his extraordinary remissness in not exacting strict conformity to the prescribed orders of the church in point of ceremony, seemed to resolve those legal determinations into their first principle of indifferency, and to lead to such a habit of inconformity as the future reduction of those tender-consciencied men to long-continued disobedience *was interpreted an innovation*." And Clarendon says of him, that "he considered the christian religion no otherwise than as it abhorred and reviled popery, and he valued those men most who did that most furiously."

George Hay, earl of Kinnoul, lord chancellor of Scotland, died suddenly at London, of apoplexy, on the 16th December of this year.

1635.—The great seal had not been intrusted to a churchman since the Reformation; but, on the death of the earl of Kinnoul, it was conferred on the archbishop of St. Andrews, to the disappointment of the lord Lorn, which caused in him a deep-rooted hatred, not only at his successful rival, but at the whole order of bishops. This promotion did not give general satisfaction; although Spottiswood was a man of great justice and

[1] Montrose and the Covenanters, 110.—Large Declaration, 12, 13, 14.

moderation, and one of the most illustrious and pious characters that ever filled the see of St. Andrews.

Four of the other bishops were introduced, and sworn of the privy council, which the king hoped would have rendered them the more respected, and have better enabled them to settle the affairs of the church, but which had the contrary effect. This accumulation of honours exposed them to the envy of the whole nobility, who in general wished them well with respect to their spiritual functions, but could not endure to see them possessed of those offices which they considered as their hereditary right; so that, instead of facilitating the king's good intentions in settling the order and government of the church, it increased the prejudice against it[1]. The lord treasurer Traquair was secretly most inimical to the bishops, whom he suspected of endeavouring to supplant him; and, in order to circumvent them, he carried on an underhand correspondence with the Presbyterian party. It is to be regretted, that a feeling of jealousy subsisted among the bishops themselves, which gave their adversaries great advantage over them. On account of the scramble for office, the nobility were enemies to the bishops; who, being men on whose fidelity the king could depend, were preferred to offices incompatible with the duties of their sacred calling, and whose promotion seems to have been regulated in some measure by court intrigue.

On the 28th of March, being Easter-eve, Patrick Forbes, bishop of Aberdeen, died, in the seventy-first year of his age, and was interred in the south aisle of his cathedral. He wrote a commentary upon the Book of Revelations. "He was wont to visit his diocese in a very singular retinue, scarce any person hearing of him until he came into the church on the Lord's Day; and according as he perceived the respective ministers to behave themselves, he gave his instructions to them." Adam Bellenden, bishop of Dunblane, was translated to Aberdeen; and James Wedderburn, Professor of Divinity at St. Andrews, was preferred to the see of Dunblane, but was not consecrated till the 11th of February next year. He was born at Dundee, and studied at Oxford; he was ordained in England, and became prebendary of Whitechurch, in the diocese of Wells, in 1631. Being deprived in 1638, he fled to England, died the following year, aged fifty-four, and was buried in the cathedral church of Canterbury, in the chapel of the Virgin Mary. Andrew Lamb also, bishop of Galloway, died this year; and Thomas Sydserf, bishop of Brechin, was translated

[1] Clarendon, i. 187.

to Galloway. Walter Whitford, son of James Whitford of that ilk, and who, Stevenson says, had a living in England, but who was then rector of Moffat, and sub-dean of Glasgow, was consecrated most likely by archbishop Spottiswood to the see of Brechin[1].

1636.—Traquair was the most deadly and most insidious foe with whom the prelates had to contend; and Principal Baillie calls him a "thorn in their side." He was also a most consummate hypocrite. In order to keep his place, he pretended to Charles the most enthusiastic zeal for the advancement of the liturgy, and the aggrandisement of the church. He tricked the archbishop of Glasgow out of the annuities of his diocese, which the king had conferred on him, and put them into his own pocket[2]. He so effectually insinuated himself into the esteem of the younger bishops, that they represented him to archbishop Laud as the only man in Scotland fit to manage ecclesiastical affairs. Unfortunately, the bishops began at the wrong end of their work: instead of first composing the liturgy, they collected the canons which authorized and sanctioned a liturgy that had not then been begun to be compiled. Maxwell, bishop of Ross, carried the book of canons up to London, and the king, who was impatient to see the good work begun, issued a proclamation for the due observation of them in his kingdom of Scotland forthwith, but, unhappily, without first having submitted them to the approbation of a General Assembly.

When the canons were published, they were objected to and disclaimed by many of the clergy, as well as the whole body of the non-conformists, both with respect to the subject-matter comprehended in them, and because they had not been consulted in their adoption. They alleged that this procedure subjected the Scoto-catholic church to the power of the king; the clergy to the command of the bishops; and the whole nation to the discipline of a foreign church; and altogether eventually, by degrees, to the idolatries and tyranny of the pope. But they had more just cause of offence, in that, contrary to ecclesiastical custom, they had not been consulted in the formation of these canons, which were imposed on them by the king's prerogative[3]. Archbishop Laud seriously advised the Scottish bishops "not to propose any business connected with the church to the king which was contrary to the laws of the

[1] Keith's Catalogue.—Stevenson's Church and State, p. 151-152.—Guthry's Memoirs, p. 14.

[2] Stevenson, i. 148. [3] Heylin's Life of Laud p. 279-284

country, which he [Laud] could not be supposed to understand; and not to put any thing in execution without the consent and approbation of the privy council[1].

The return of bishop Maxwell from court, and the publication of the book of canons, gave an opportunity for the presbyterian party to excite a clamour throughout the nation that religion was undermined by a conspiracy betwixt the archbishop of Canterbury and the Scottish bishops, suborned, as they said, by him to bring in the mass book. The older bishops became alarmed at the ferment among the sincerer sort, which their experience taught them would not be confined to mere grumbling; and they wrote to Dr. Laud, requesting him to advise the king to defer the liturgy for some time. But Traquair, anxious to ruin the bishops and their cause, which he thought would be most easily accomplished by precipitating the introduction of the liturgy, while the nation was in a state of alarm and agitation on its account, procured the signatures of several of the bishops that had been most recently promoted, to archbishop Laud, recommending him to proceed with the liturgy. With this Traquair posted up to court, and suggested to Laud, and through him to the king, that there was no danger to be apprehended, and represented the elder bishops as timorous, procrastinating men, who feared danger where none existed, protesting that if his grace would move the king to lay his commands on him, he should, *on his life*, carry through the business without any opposition. Dr. Laud was completely deceived by Traquair's dissimulation, and never suspected him of the treachery which he meditated; yet objecting that a layman should be the principal instrument in a work of this nature, he procured a warrant from the king, commanding the bishops without any delay to proceed[2]. On the receipt of this peremptory command, some of the bishops were somewhat disconcerted; but others were rejoiced, and considered the treacherous Traquair as their best friend. There was now, however, no alternative, and, relying on Traquair's ample promises of assistance and support, they took courage and began the work. The liturgy was sanctioned by an act of council, and they resolved to introduce it first in Edinburgh. It had been deliberately compiled and examined by churchmen, and it had been approved of by episcopal authority, and its practice was warranted by the king and privy council. The king's proclamation for its immediate use presupposed its ecclesiastical sanction by the governors of the church, which, in the primi-

[1] Clarendon. [2] Guthry's Memoirs, p. 19.

tive church, would have been held sufficient. But this did not satisfy the democratic party, and it was eagerly assumed by the agitators as a cause of national complaint and tumult. "And what was that ecclesiastical sanction," inquires Mr. Skinner, "which it seems it should have got? Was every individual minister to be consulted, and his vote obtained, to ratify the decision of the king and the bishops? If so, why not every individual of the laity be indulged the same authoritative privilege, from the great earl of Rothes down to the meanest cobbler in the kingdom? And when or how would this have ended[1]?"

The violent presbyterians made every effort to excite a spirit of resistance to the clergy throughout the nation, jealous fears of the supremacy of the English church over that of Scotland, and of the danger of relapsing into popery. It was alleged, that the bishops had a design of subjecting the church to their own caprice, and of changing the laws at their own pleasure. However unfounded these accusations were, they served to keep up that spirit of agitation which the party had enjoyed so few opportunities of putting in practice since the restoration of regular government, and it operated as a stimulus for greater opposition to the liturgy when it should make its appearance. "Yet they [the presbyterian party] would not suffer (which showed wonderful power and wonderful dexterity) any disorder to break out upon all this occasion, but all was quiet, except spreading of libels against the bishops, and propagating that spirit as much as they could by their correspondence in England, where they found too many every day transported by the same jealousies, in expectation that those seeds of jealousy from the canons would grow apace, and produce such a reception for the liturgy as they wished[2]."

The liturgy was at last published; it varied in a very trifling degree from the English book, and that chiefly in the communion service, which was taken from the first book of Edward VI. and it was the identical book which was first used in the beginning of the Scottish reformation, and at that time sanctioned by an act of parliament[3]. It appears that Cardinal Richlieu

[1] Skinner's Eccl. Hist. i. 305. [2] Clarendon.

[3] There is a little difference in the arrangement of the Scripture Lessons; and the Apocryphal books are *entirely excluded*—a sure refutation of its popish origin and tendency. The Epistles and Gospels are the same, and also the Collects, except on the third Sunday in Advent, when the Scotch Collect is, "Lord, we beseech thee, give ear to our prayers, and by thy gracious visitation lighten the darkness of our hearts by our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen." The prefatory sentences are taken from Ezek. xviii. 31, 32; Prov. xxviii. 13, which displace Ezek. xviii. 27; and St. Luke, xv. 18, 19, in the English Book. The office of public baptism is

fomented the distractions in Scotland: he had agents who insinuated themselves, under different appearances, with all parties, both in Scotland and in England;—some of them in the shape of violent admirers of archbishop Laud, and others, of furious presbyterians; but all of them employed to widen the differences between Charles and his people. The nation was divided into three parties: the first consisted of the remains of the Roman Catholics, among whom were several noble families, and also men of desperate fortunes, who were easily gained over to Richlieu's views; the second were the most numerous, who were possessed of the greatest share of property, and attached to episcopacy and monarchy; the third consisted of the furious presbyterians, blind followers of their godly ministers, ignorant, bold, and enthusiastic, who were in close correspondence with the English puritans, (a sect planted by the jesuits), through the medium of one Borthwick, whom they had sent down as their agent into Scotland, to encourage the presbyterians with the promise of ample assistance in resisting the use of the liturgy, and eventually of exterminating episcopacy[1]. "Scotland was swarming with poor clergymen, who, for the most part, uncouth, unlearned, and unenlightened, and hopeless of becoming bishops, yet felt their

word for word the same, except that the exhortation to the sponsors, at the conclusion of the English office, is omitted in the Scottish. The greatest difference is in the communion office, and which is still used in many rural congregations to this day. Different verses of Scripture were selected for the sentences at the offertory; then follows the prayer for the church militant, which is the same as in the English service, down to the words "any other adversity," when it closes with the following sublime and beautiful words:—"And we also bless thy holy name for all those thy servants who, having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labours. And we yield unto thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all thy saints, who have been the choice vessels of thy grace, and the lights of the world in their several generations: most humbly beseeching thee, that we may have grace to follow the example of their steadfastness in thy faith and obedience to thy holy commandments, that at the day of the general resurrection, we, and all they which are of the mystical body of thy Son, may be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.' Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only mediator and advocate. Amen." Then follows the exhortation and other prayers to the consecration, at the end of which there is a "Memorial or Prayer of Oblation," which embodies the first of the two prayers in the post-communion of the English service, with this sentence prefixed:—"Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy divine majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same. And we entirely desire thy Fatherly goodness," &c.

[1] Guthry's Gen. Hist. ix. 229.

passions and their lungs strong enough to afford them a chance, *when the waters were troubled*, of emulating the popularity of Knox[1]."

1637.—The presbyterian party declaimed incessantly against the liturgy, imputing idolatry to the most innocent, and superstition to the most indifferent actions. From their pulpits, in their ordinary conversation, and in pamphlets silently but industriously dispersed through the nation, they clamoured indignantly against it, as being worse, they said, than the mass itself. Those who complied incurred the reproach of idolatry from the presbyterians, and those who refused to conform were reputed, by the church party, seditious and dangerous sectaries, not less hostile to the church than disaffected to government. Such uncharitable antipathies on both sides were mistaken for zeal for religion, and gave dreadful note of the convulsions that followed[2].

Andrew Boyd, bishop of Argyle, died on the 22d of December of the preceding year, aged seventy. "He was a good man, and did much good in his diocese, where he always resided." The king appointed James Fairly, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, to this see, at the recommendation of lord Traquair, to whom he had been formerly tutor. He was consecrated on the 15th of August, two days before the riots about the liturgy began. He seems to have been a most unworthy son of the church, which may account for Traquair's patronage; for after his deprivation by the rebels the following year, he made application to be appointed minister, on the presbyterian model, of the parish of Laswade, in Mid-Lothian[3].

The Book of Common Prayer was deliberately compiled by the Scottish bishops, men of undoubted piety and abilities; and it was afterwards subjected to the revisal of the two English bishops already mentioned. Having been sanctioned by the king and authorised by the privy council, it was ordered, by proclamation at the market-crosses of all the burghs in the kingdom, to be forthwith used in the churches; and every parish was ordered to provide at least two books, under pain of the minister being declared a rebel[4]. The primate instructed the bishops to make their clergy intimate to their congregations that the Liturgy would be read on the following Sunday. In Edinburgh, the clergy, with the exception of Andrew Ramsay,

[1] Montrose and the Covenanters, i. 100.
[2] Baillie's Letters, i. 2.
[3] Keith's Catalogue.—Stevenson's Church and State, 157. Bulfour's Annals, ii. 224.

obeyed and read the intimation from their several pulpits. The whole city was agitated by the arts and declamation of the presbyterian party,—a sure presage of the infamous course which they had determined to pursue, and of the ungovernable opposition which they had excited in the mob. Charles had intended that the reading of the Liturgy should have commenced on Easter-day; and it was read on that day in the dioceses of Ross, Dunblane, and Brechin; where there was neither disturbance nor opposition. But on the treacherous representation of some of the privy council, the king permitted it to be postponed till July, in Edinburgh; "but the delay was procured by HOPE, the king's advocate, *who knew that the party of the presbyterians were not yet ripe for action*[1]."

The presbyterian party had been joined by those of the nobility that were likely to be sufferers by the *surrendry* of the ecclesiastical property, to which they had no other or better title than robbery and usurpation. They had inflamed the minds of such of the clergy and ministers as were averse to a liturgy, because it curbed the licentious liberties which they took in their extemporary prayers, and they in turn had preached their hearers into a state fit for rebellion. The liturgy and book of canons were therefore made the plausible excuse for sedition in the first place, and eventually for rebellion. But the liturgy and canons were not novelties; for it was agreed, in an Assembly in king James's time, to compile and use a liturgy, and the five articles of Perth were agreed to in a full Assembly, and had been in use for several years. But now that these articles were embodied in the liturgy, they became still more the objects of party antipathy, as innovations upon religion. But, says Heylin, "it was rather *gain* than godliness which brought the great men of the realm to espouse this quarrel; who, by the commission of surrendries, began to fear the losing of their tithes and superiorities, to which they could pretend no other title than plain usurpation. And, on the other side, it was *ambition*, and not zeal, which inflamed the presbyters; who had no other way to invade that power which was conferred upon the bishops by divine institution, and countenanced by many acts of parliament in the reign of king James, than by embracing that occasion to incense the people, to put the whole nation into tumult, and thereby to compel the bishops and the regular clergy to forsake the kingdom. So the Genevans dealt before with their bishop and clergy, when the reforming humour first came upon them; and

[1] Guthry's Gen. Hist. ix. 226.

what could they do less in Scotland than follow the example of their mother city[1]?"

Sunday, the 23d of July, was the day appointed for reading the liturgy in the cathedral church of St. Giles. There were present, besides the ordinary congregation, archbishop Spottiswood, primate and chancellor of the kingdom, the whole privy council, the lords of session, and the city magistrates, the archbishop of Glasgow, and several other bishops. Hannah, dean of Edinburgh, was appointed to read the prayers, and Dr. Lindsay, the bishop of Edinburgh, was afterwards to preach. No sooner had the dean in his surplice commenced, than the "rascal multitude" created such a noise and clamour throughout the church, that not a word could be heard; and then a shower of sticks, stones, bludgeons, and joint-stools, were thrown at the dean's head. "All was confusion worse confounded," when the bishop entered the pulpit, hoping to appease the madness of the people, by reminding the rioters of the sacredness of the place, and of their duty to God and the king. But, instead of allaying the tumult, the bishop's presence only served to increase their ferocity and rage, and to add blasphemy to sacrilege. A poor woman, Jenny Geddes by name, ushered in the future war, by throwing a stool at the bishop's head, to the imminent danger of his life. At this stage of the riot, the archbishop of St. Andrews, being also the lord chancellor, from his seat in the gallery commanded the provost and magistrates to suppress the riot; which at last, with difficulty, they accomplished, thrusting out the rioters by main force, who had been sent there by the presbyterian brethren for the express purpose of exciting a tumult and sedition. After which, the dean proceeded in the service, in dumb show; for the clamour and noise and breaking of windows by the rioters without, actuated by the malignant spirit of the party, created such distraction that no attention could be paid to the service. Fairly, bishop of Argyle, read the liturgy on the same day, in the Greyfriars church, where he met with some opposition: "upon which sudden disorderly and fearful change of God's public worship, the grievous terrors and cries of poor common people [who had been taught to set up a howl] were so great, that the service was stopped at that time[2]." When the council and magistrates returned home, the rage and violence of the mob knew no bounds: they pursued the bishops with the most opprobrious and indecent invectives, and

[1] History of the Presbyterians, lib. xiii. 247.
[2] Stevenson's Church and State, p. 168.

with cries of bringing in superstition and popery, and of enslaving the people. But not contented with abusing the bishops with their tongues, they pelted them with filth and stones, to the hazard of their lives. Dr. Lindsay, the bishop of Edinburgh, was especially the object of their savage barbarity; whose episcopal robe they tore, assaulted his person, knocked him down, and trampled him under foot on the street; and he would have been killed on the spot, but for the prompt interference of the earl of Weymss, who despatched an armed party for his protection. The popular fury was so violently directed against that prelate, that it was with the utmost difficulty that the magistrates had preserved him from being murdered in the church, and at his own altar, during the riot.

The liturgy met with the same reception in the other churches of the city; the same tumult, execrations, and clamour of superstition and popery, and murderous threats against the bishops, attended the other clergy, who, with doubtful sincerity, began to read it. Some of them did not make the attempt. In the interval, the privy council met, at which the lord provost and magistrates appeared, and, as they engaged to exert their utmost energy to maintain order and quietness, the liturgy was again read in the afternoon in St. Giles', and also in some other churches. Still the mob kept possession of the streets, shouting, "A pope, a pope! Antichrist! The sword of the Lord and of Gideon!" They again attacked the bishop returning from church, who was then saved from being murdered on the street, by the earl of Roxburgh, who received him into his coach, and drove off quickly. The mob pursued and pelted the coach with stones and other missiles; and they were only preserved by the footmen, who drew their swords and kept them off. Baillie, a presbyterian, admits "that such a tumult was never heard of since the reformation;" and this day, he says, was distinguished in the annals of sacrilege, by the appellation of the "Stony Sunday[1]."

"This tumult," says bishop Guthry, "was taken to be but a rash emergent, without any pre-deliberation; whereas, the truth is, it was the result of a consultation at Edinburgh in April, at which time Mr. Alexander Henderson came thither from his brethren in Fife, and Mr. David Dickson from those in the West country. And these two having communicated to my lord Balmerino and sir Thomas Hope, the minds of those they came from, and gotten their approbation thereto,

[1] Guthry's Mem. 22.—Clarendon's Hist.—Baillie's Lett. i. 5.—Cruikshank's Hist. 26.—Arnot's Hist. of Edin.—Stevenson's Church and State, 168, 169.—Large Declaration, 23-25.

did afterwards meet at the house of Nicolas Balfour, in the Cowgate with Nicolas, Eupham Henderson, Bethia and Elspa Craig, and several other matrons, and recommended to them that they and their adherents might give the first affront to the book,—assuring them, that men should afterwards take the business out of their hands. The matrons having undertaken so to do, Henderson and Dickson returned home [1].

Traquair, who offered to guarantee *with his life* that the liturgy should be peaceably read, was treacherously absent, which gives reason to conclude that he wished well to the plans of the godly brethren. Lest he should be compelled, as one of the king's ministers, to interrupt the sacrilegious work, he remained at Dalkeith. On the following day, the chancellor, with the other bishops, despatched an express to the king, giving an account of the riot, and of the treasurer's absence from his post. The privy council were dissatisfied at this, and issued a proclamation, commanding that the reading of the liturgy should be continued; that the inhabitants should remain tranquil, and not offer any injury, by word or deed, to any of the ecclesiastical or civil estate, on pain of death; and to keep up appearances, they committed two or three servants. Traquair wrote to the king, excusing the city, but blaming the rabble for the late atrocious riot; but, at the same time, he wrote privately to the marquis of Hamilton, and directly accused the bishops as the cause of all the disturbance and sedition which had happened. The magistrates, apprehensive of the royal displeasure, wrote a fawning letter to the archbishop of Canterbury, excusing themselves, and begging his good offices with his majesty, to persuade him of their and the citizens' innocence in the late tumult, and of their obsequiousness to obey his majesty's commands. They even carried their hypocrisy so far as to promise an addition of stipend to those ministers who should read the book, and, moreover, they offered to protect the persons of the clergy [2].

On the 25th of August the lords of the council wrote to the king, with an account of the late riot, and he returned the following answer. But Baillie says, that the lords of the council were offended at the archbishop for having written immediately after the riot to the king, and therefore they declared writing till Friday, when they extenuated the affair as much as possible; but took care to throw all the blame on the bishops.

[1] Guthry's Mem. 20. This account is corroborated by lord Clarendon.
[2] Stevenson's Ch. and State, ii. 188.

"CHARLES R.

"Right trusty, &c.—We have considered your letter, and we find that our former directions have produced very shallow effects; neither do you hereby propose any new expedient, but only you desire some of the clergy and laity should be sent for to deal with us therein, which we conceive not to be fit; and by a needless noise make it appear, that either we have a very slack council or bad subjects, which we will never believe, having had so good a proof of their affection heretofore; but rather will that a sufficient number of you attend still at Edinburgh, or near thereabouts, during the vacation, till the service-book be settled. And we are not well satisfied, neither with you nor our city of Edinburgh, that after the service was read upon Sunday afternoon, it should have been intermitted immediately thereafter; and that no delinquents that were actors and accessories to that insolence and riot committed in the tumult that day, were anyways censured for terrifying of others from attempting the like; and it doth likewise seem very strange unto us, that the ministers of Edinburgh having offered to begin the reading of the service-book, providing they were secured from injury, and relieved by our said city of the said charge within a month thereafter, that the said offer was not accepted and performed; and it is our pleasure that every bishop cause to read the said service-book within his own diocese, as the bishops of Ross and Dunblaine have already done. As likewise you cause warn our burghs particularly, that none of them make choice of any magistrates but such as will answer for their conformity. So expecting that you will extend the utmost of your endeavours, by doing what is necessary, and preventing any inconvenience that may occur, that we may have a good account with diligence, we bid you farewell.—From our Court at Oatlands, the 10th of September, 1637[1]."

The synod of Glasgow met on the last Wednesday of August. At the opening of the synodical meetings it was the custom for some one to preach *ad clerum*. The archbishop accordingly appointed Mr. Baillie to address his brethren, and "to incite all his hearers to obey the church canons, and to practice the service." He replied to the archbishop, and gave "a flat refusal, shewing the irresolution of his own mind." He was again commanded to preach, but he again refused, when Mr. Annan, rector of Ayr, was appointed to preach at

[1] Balfour's Annals, ii. 232-233.

the opening of the synod in Glasgow. Mr. Annan took for his text, 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, and, says Baillie, "in the last half of his sermon, from the making of prayers, ran out upon the liturgy, and spake for defence of it in whole, and sundry most plausible parts of it, as well, in my poor judgment, as any in the isle of Britain could have done, considering all circumstances; howsoever, he did maintain to the dislike of all in an unfit time, that which was hanging in suspense betwixt the king and the country. Of his sermon among us in the synod, not a word; but in the town, among the women, a great din." On the following day, Mr. Lindsay, minister of Lanark, preached, and as he was entering the pulpit, "some of the women in his ear assured him, that if he should twitch (touch) the service-book in his sermon, he should be rent out of his pulpit: he took the advice, and let the matter alone." During the day the women contented themselves with railing and invectives; and "about thirty or forty of our *honest.st* women, in one voice, before the bishop and magistrates, did fall in railing, cursing, scolding, with clamours on Mr. Annan: some two of the meanest were taken to the tolbooth." Late in the evening Mr. Annan went out with three or four of the clergy, when he was immediately assaulted by some hundreds of enraged women "*of all qualities*," who beat him with their fists and staves: "they beat him *sore;* his cloake, ruff, hatt, were rent. However, upon his cries, and candles set out from many windows (it was a dark night), he escaped all bloody wounds; *yet he was in great danger even of killing.*" So many "*of the best quality*" were engaged in this disgraceful riot, that it was found advisable not to make any inquiry after the rioters. The following day the magistrates accompanied him to the outskirts of the town, to prevent farther molestation, because many intended to have renewed the tumult, and were collecting for that purpose[1].

Henderson and Bruce were charged to purchase two books each, and read the liturgy in their churches, under pain of horning. These, in their turn, at the suggestion of lord Balmerino and sir Thomas Hope, petitioned the privy council for a suspension of the charge, as the safest method of eluding the order, gaining time, and of perplexing their superiors. Their petition was received with marks of encouragement by their secret friends in the privy council, who in reality and underhand were fomenting the opposition to the liturgy[2]. Had

[1] Baillie's Letters and Journals, ed. 1841, vol. i. pp. 20, 21.
[2] Balfour's Annals, vol. ii. 227.

they done their duty it would have been cheerfully accepted; but their jealousy and secret hostility to the bishops, and their avaricious desire to retain the plunder of the church, were so great, that they embroiled their country in all the exasperations of religious animosity, for the purpose of degrading them, and retaining their property. The council suspended the order for reading the liturgy till his majesty's pleasure was known, to whom they wrote, desiring to know his mind against the 20th of September, to which day the petitioners were referred for an answer[1]. "Presbyterians at this time did generally stir up themselves and one another to take hold on God, and seemed resolved *to give Him no rest* until he made his church a praise in the midst of them!"[2] Mr. Henderson was at the head of the anti-liturgical faction, and of the presbyterian interest. Bishop Guthry says of him, that "he had been in his youth *very episcopal*," for which archbishop Gladstanes conferred on him the church of Leuchars, near St. Andrews; "and before he had been many years there, he fell into intimate acquaintance with Mr. William Scott, in his declining days. Upon Mr. Henderson all the ministry of that judgment depended; and no wonder, for in gravity, learning, wisdom, and state policy, he far exceeded any of them[3]."

The bishops expected that the council would have rejected Henderson's petition, and have inflicted some exemplary punishment on the rioters. They knew Traquair's power in the council to be absolute, and when, notwithstanding his professions, he received the petitions, and made no inquiry after the rioters, they began to suspect his sincerity when it was too late.

The secret encouragement that was given to Henderson by the members of the privy council was communicated by him to his friends in different parts of the country, who, ministers as well as laity, hastened to assemble in Edinburgh; and by the appointed day, the earls of Rothes, Cassillis, Eglinton, Home, Lothian, and Wymess; the lords Lindsay, Yester, Balmerino, Cranstoun, and London, and a multitude of ministers and burgesses from Fife and the western shires, had arrived. Sir Thomas Hope, his majesty's advocate, secretly advised the malcontents how to act, to avoid incurring the pains of law, and yet so as to defeat his majesty's intentions. To prevent suspicion, he pitched on lord Balmerino (who made this return for the king's clemency in pardoning him) and the noted Hen-

[1] Guthry's Memoirs, 20.—Balfour's Annals, ii. 227.
[2] Stevenson's Church and State, 173. [3] Memoirs, 21.

derson,—a man of great abilities, and a second Melville,—to come to him secretly, from time to time, and receive instructions. Traquair also privately encouraged the seditious party, although to all appearance he affected the most enthusiastic zeal in the king's service; and it was not till too late that he was suspected by the bishops of that duplicity and treachery which he had practised all along, but to whom they had hitherto fatally trusted. Nearly all the parishes in Ayr, Fife, Lothian, Clydesdale, Stirling, and Strathearn, sent in petitions, "to beseech the council to deprecate the king, that he would not urge the heavy burden of the liturgy[1]." Henderson, Dickson, Kerr, and other ministers who had brought up these petitions, concerted a plan for securing the concurrence of the clergy throughout the kingdom: they despatched Mr. Henry Rollock into Lothian, Merse, and Teviotdale; Mr. Andrew Ramsay to Angus and Mearns; and Mr. Robert Murray to Perth and Stirlingshire; to solicit the clergy in those parts to join with them in opposing the farther use of the liturgy. They sent instructions also to Mr. Andrew Cant to use the like diligence in the north[2].

Had Charles been honestly and faithfully served by the privy council, there is no doubt but that the liturgy would have been introduced without any serious opposition. But the traitors by whom the unhappy king was served lighted up the train, instead of vigorously quenching it; they secretly encouraged the mob in their lawless proceedings, and insulted the bishops whom they appeared to support. On the 17th of October, to which day the council had deferred giving the king's answer to the petitions, a proclamation was read at the market-cross, commanding the liturgy to be read in Edinburgh and other places adjacent; the council and session to remove first to Linlithgow, and thereafter to Stirling; and the whole petitioners to retire from Edinburgh to their own houses within twenty-four hours, under pain of rebellion. This roused the furious passions of the mob: the *pious women* assembled in great numbers on the High Street, and signalized their superstitious zeal, by attacking the bishop of Galloway, who was quietly going to the council chamber in company with some friends, who with much difficulty prevented him from being murdered. These heroines next beleaguered the city council, threatening to burn the house about the ears of the provost and bailies, unless they would send two com-

[1] Stevenson's Ch. and State, 179.
[2] Guthry's Mem. 27.—Stevenson's Ch. and State.

missioners to join the rebels in petitioning; which, to appease these viragos, they promised to do. These outrageous amazons had been collected and instructed by agents from the secret traitors in his majesty's council, and the presbyterian brethren: their war cry was—"God defend those who will defend God's cause, and confound the service-book and all its maintainers!"

The anti-liturgical ministers and nobles arranged themselves into TABLES, or COMMITTEES, and conducted their opposition with order; the result of the connivance and secret encouragement they met with from the members of the privy council. They despatched emissaries to spread the flames of religious anarchy and discord throughout the kingdom, and collect additional numbers to their cause. Notwithstanding the proclamation, commanding strangers to leave the capital, they remained, and met the next day at their several Tables. Lest the uninitiated ministers should obey the proclamation, and retire from the city, the noble conspirators were obliged to let them so far into their secret as to divulge the double dealing of the earl of Traquair, who, they said, would wink at their remaining in town, provided they kept within doors. They contrived to hold secret meetings, and were met by Balmerino and Henderson, who secretly received instructions from Sir Thomas Hope. Those factious firebrands, who had been driven into exile on account of their seditious opposition to the Perth Articles, now returned to aid the good old cause of opposition; and from the puritans of England they received the most comfortable assurances of co-operation and support, in extirpating episcopacy from the three kingdoms.

With so much open and secret encouragement, Henderson, at the instigation of the traitor Hope, proposed to the ministers, that "whereas they had formerly supplicated to be freed from the service-book, they might now tax the bishops for their contrary party, complain of them as underminers of religion, and *crave justice* to be done on them." The ministers were startled at this proposition; they were not yet prepared for such decisive measures, that carried all the appearance of being ended in blood. They accordingly demurred; and professed that their only object was to be freed from the obnoxious service-book, for otherwise they had no hostility to the bishops. Henderson reported this unexpected moderation on the part of the ministers to the lords composing the Tables, who sent the earl of Rothes and lord Loudon to persuade them. These, by threats and promises, soon prevailed on them to challenge the bishops. This challenge they had prepared beforehand and carried with

them; and, before leaving, they procured the subscriptions of the whole of the ministers. This instrument was delivered to the clerk of council, and copies given to each of the ministers, who carried them to their respective parishes to be subscribed by all ranks, and to be returned to the council against the next meeting, on the 15th November[1]. On their return to their homes, the ministers in the presbyterian interest thundered from their pulpits the most dreadful curses and execrations against all who should refuse to sign these documents, which greatly increased the number of petitioners, and among others was added the name of the illustrious earl of MONTROSE.

The multitudes of people who had been collected in Edinburgh, and who were unacquainted with the real motives of the movement, rather embarrassed the leaders; and, therefore, it was proposed that they should all return to their homes, leaving a certain number of delegates from each class, who were to remain in Edinburgh, and watch the movements of the privy council which sat at Dalkeith. It met there on the 19th December, when the insurgent noblemen in the presbyterian interest presented a "declinature against the bishops, *that they, being now made a party, might not sit and vote in that judicature.*" Lord Loudon, in a long speech, said, among other things, they complained against "the innovations introduced, [which] are chiefly the service-book, the book of canons and constitutions, and high commission; in which service-book are sown the seeds of divers superstitions and heresies, and that the Roman mass, in many and substantial points, is made up therein; which service-book and other novations, moreover, have neither warrant of General Assembly nor of act of parliament, but, contrary to both, are introduced by the bishops, who have caused set forth a book of canons wherein it is ordained, whosoever shall affirm that the service-book contains any thing erroneous shall be excommunicate; which book is the usher and forerunner of the service-book printed thereafter, which, by the bishops' conveyance, was ratified by act of parliament, and confirmed long before it was seen and printed; the bishops for the time making up the council, no nobleman being present there who did oppose it, and thereafter by public proclamation did come forth, charging all his majesty's subjects to conform thereto, as the only form of God's public worship to be used within the kingdom; . . . that our desires tend to no other end but the preservation of true religion, the lawful liberties of the subject, and *the bishops and prelates delinquent*

[1] Guthry's Memoirs, 26. - Stevenson's Church and State, 181, 182.

taken order with according to justice. We crave neither their blood nor any harm to their persons; but that the wrongs and abuses done by them may be truly remonstrated to his majesty, that, after due trial, such order may be taken as may effectually restrain their exorbitant power for the time to come[1]." On the conclusion of the speech, Traquair, who presided in council, "acknowledged the truth of the relation, and equity of the petition, and so removed the parties complainers. It passed to interlocutor, and thereafter in an act." The result of this council was, that Traquair was despatched to London to communicate to the king the state of affairs.

The bishops strenuously objected to his being sent on such a mission, having now discovered his duplicity; but they were now set aside by this act of the council, that, as they were a party concerned, they should neither sit nor vote in the council. Every member of the privy council, with the solitary exception of Sir John Hay, clerk-register, were abettors and instigators of the petitioners, and enemies of the bishops[2].

When information of the rebellious state of the Scottish affairs reached Charles, he was struggling against an infinity of troubles and difficulties in the conduct of the government of England. His Scottish privy council had betrayed him; they gave him false information, and withheld a true statement of the extent and formidable nature of the opposition till it was too late to retreat with dignity. Hope, the king's advocate, precipitated the fanatics into all the guilt of rebellion, by the advice which he gave them how to act so as to counteract Charles's benevolent designs without incurring the penalties of law. Charles had assumed no powers but what were perfectly compatible with law and justice; and in introducing a liturgy, he only complied with the petition of a General Assembly in the latter part of the late king's reign, that a liturgy might be composed for the use of the national church. In fact, he only restored what had been practised in the beginning of the Reformation, both before and after the legal establishment of the titular episcopacy in the year 1560. In the preface to the Directory agreed on by the Westminster divines, it is acknowledged, that, "in the beginning of the blessed Reformation, our wise and pious ancestors took care to set forth an order for redress of many things, which they then, by the word discovered to be vain, erroneous, superstitious, and idolatrous, in the pub-

[1] Lord Loudon's Speech before the Privy Council, cited in Balfour's Annals, ii 240–249.

[2] Guthry's Memoirs, 31.—Baillie's Letters.

lic worship of God. This occasioned many godly and learned men to *rejoice much in the Book of Common Prayer*, at that time set forth; because the mass and the rest of the Latin service being removed, the public worship was celebrated in our own tongue: many of the common people, also, received benefit by hearing the Scriptures read in their own language, which formerly were unto them as a book that is sealed[1]."

In the preface to the liturgy, the compilers have the following remarks, and some of them were in active life very soon after the Reformation, and had the best opportunities of ascertaining the truth:—"Our first reformers were of the same mind with us, as appears from the ordinance they made, that in all the parishes of the realm the Common Prayer should be read weekly, on Sundays and *other* festival days, with the lessons of the Old and New Testament, conform to the order of the Book of Common Prayer: meaning that of England; for it is known that divers years after we had no other order for Common Prayer. This is recorded to have been the first head concluded in a frequent council of the lords and barons professing Jesus Christ. We keep the words of the history[2]. Religion was not then placed in rites and gestures, nor men taken with the fancy of extemporary prayer. Sure, the public worship of God in his church, being the most solemn action of us his poor creatures here below, ought to be performed by a liturgy advisedly set and framed, and not according to the sudden and various fancies of men. This shall suffice for the present to have said. The God of mercy confirm our hearts in his truth, and preserve us alike from profaneness and superstition. Amen[3]."

While the course of events in Scotland was fast drawing to a crisis, the church and people of England sat still with the utmost indifference, and beheld their neighbour's house on fire without making any effort to prevent the flames from reaching their own dwelling. And the black cloud which at first was no bigger than a man's hand, was spreading over the whole northern horizon, and the heavens were black with treason and rebellion. Yet it excited no notice in England then, as the same course of agitation creates little apprehension at the present day that the same calamities may again arise to the church of England. "But the truth is," says Clarendon, "there was so little curiosity in the court or the country to know any thing

[1] Preface to the Directory for Public Worship, agreed on by the Assembly of Divines, at Westminster, 1645, in the Confession of Faith.

[2] History of the Church of Scotland, p. 218.

[3] Preface to the Common Prayer of the Church of Scotland.

of Scotland, or what was done there, that, when the whole nation was solicitous to know what passed weekly in Germany and Poland, and all other parts of Europe, no man ever inquired what was doing in Scotland, nor had that kingdom a place or mention in one page of any Gazette; and even after the advertisement of this preamble to rebellion, no mention was made of it at the council board, but such a dispatch made into Scotland upon it as expressed the king's dislike and displeasure, and obliged the lords of the council there to appear more vigorously in the vindication of his authority and suppression of those tumults. But all was too little. That people, after they had once begun, pursued the business vigorously, with all imaginable contempt of the government; and though in the hubbub on the first day there appeared no body of name or reckoning, but the actors were really of the dregs of the people, yet they discovered, by the countenance of that day, that few men of rank were forward to engage themselves in the quarrel on behalf of the bishops; whereupon more considerable persons every day appeared against them, and (as heretofore in the case of St. Paul, *the Jews stirred up the devout and honourable women*), the women and ladies of the best quality declared themselves of the party, and with all the reproaches imaginable, made war upon the bishops, as introducers of popery and superstition, against which they avowed themselves to be irreconcileable enemies: and their husbands did not long defer the owning the same spirit; insomuch as within a few days the bishops durst not appear in the streets, nor in any courts or houses, but were in danger of their lives; and such of the lords as durst be in their company, or seemed to desire to rescue them from violence, had their coaches torn in pieces, and their persons assaulted, insomuch as they were glad to send for some of those great men, who did indeed govern the rabble, though they appeared not in it, who readily came and redeemed them out of their hands: so that by the time new orders came from England, there was scarce a bishop left in Edinburgh, and not a minister who durst read the liturgy in any church[1]."

Some few simple people might have been really actuated by religious motives; but the noble leaders, and the great bulk of the disaffected, had other and more selfish ends in view than the cause of religion. The higher orders were spurred on by covetousness, which is idolatry, and the root of all evil; while the inferior were inflamed with hatred of popery and

[1] Clarendon's Rebellion, i. 180, 181.

the dread of its near approach; and *a strong delusion* to believe a lie, had been sent upon them as a punishment that Charles intended to bring in the mass by means of the liturgy. That mental delusion still unhappily continues to this day: for presbyterians glory in those atrocities of their ancestors, which ought to be subjects of their greatest shame and humiliation. "What," says Baillie, a presbyterian! "shall be the event, God knows; there was in our land never such an appearance of a stir; the whole people think popery at the doors; the scandalous pamphlets which come daily new from England add fuel to this flame; no man may speak any thing in public *for the king's part*, except he would have himself *marked for a sacrifice to be killed one day*. I think our people *possessed with a bloody devil*, far above any thing that ever I could have imagined, though the mass in Latin had been presented. The ministers who have command of their mind, do disavow their unchristian humour, but are no ways so zealous against the devil of their fury as they are against the seducing spirit of the bishops. For myself, I think God, to revenge the crying sins of all estates and professions (which no example of our neighbours' calamities would move us to repent), is going to execute his long denounced threatenings, and to give us over *unto madness*, that we may every one shoot his sword in our neighbour's heart[1]."

[1] Baillie's Letters and Journals, i. 23.

CHAPTER XIV.

PRIMACY OF ARCHBISHOP SPOTTISWOOD.

THE TABLES, THE COVENANT, THE GLASGOW ASSEMBLY, AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE CHURCH.

1638.—The Tables.—Traquair gives secret information to the rebels.—Council assemble at Stirling.—King's proclamation—met by a protest.—Bishop of Galloway assaulted.—Proposal to murder archbishop Spottiswood.—The SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT—its origin—its objects and obligations.—Motives that induced the king to appoint the marquis of Hamilton lord High Commissioner—his arrival—his first measures.—Multitude congregated in the capital.—The brethren offer to harangue before his grace.—The liturgy denounced.—A proclamation and protest.—Suspension of the canons and liturgy.—Commissioner returns to London—comes back.—Demands of the covenanted lords.—Hamilton recommends king James's covenant or bond to be renewed—empowered to summon an Assembly.—Activity of the covenanters.—Commissioners sent to Aberdeen—cold reception.—Citizens generally hostile to the covenant.—Drs. Forbes and Barron.—Commissioner empowered to summon a parliament and an Assembly—the conditions not agreeable to the covenanting chiefs—Hamilton takes another journey to London.—The covenant of 1580 renewed—covenanters rail at it—their inconsistency—clamour for an Assembly—Commissioner proclaims one—discharges sundry acts of parliament and Assembly.—An Assembly and parliament summoned.—The proclamation.—The Tables protest.—Artful conduct of the covenanters.—Glasgow address to the king.—The official opinion of the lord advocate.—The Assembly is packed by the Tables.—Charges produced against the bishops.—Orders issued for the elections.—Libel on the bishops.—A prophetess.—The industry of the jesuits—assert that the liturgy was examined and approved at Rome.—Abernethy's story.—The commissioner's activity.—The mode of election.—Meeting of the Assembly.—Marquis of Huntly's exertions.—Protest by the bishop of Aberdeen and his clergy.—Opening of the Assembly—first session—difficulties of the meeting—many unconstitutionally present—none admitted but by ticket—Baillie's account of them—first proceedings—refuse to read the bishop's declinature.—Second session—the king's letter read—declinature again urged and rejected—Henderson elected moderator.—Third session—election of the clerk—Johnston, of Warriston, chosen—new registers produced—bishops' protest again refused.—The fourth session.—Fifth session—protest against lay elders—rejected.—Sixth session—the bishop's protest read—other protests from inferior clergy.—Seventh session—

spurious registers—replies to the bishop's declinature—perplexity of the commissioner—his speech before dissolving the Assembly—moderator's reply—the commissioner's answer—private instructions from the Tables—commissioner dissolves the Assembly—protests against it—the moderator puts it to the vote whether or not the Assembly will dissolve.—Covenanting nobles protest.—The Assembly constitute themselves judges of the bishops.—The proclamation for the dissolution of the Assembly.—Rothes protests.—Argyle joins the Assembly—his declaration.—The commissioner retires.—Accession of lord Erskine and others to the covenanters.—First session—proclamation for dissolution met by a protest.—Second session—several preceding Assemblies condemned.—Third session—Dr. Panther deposed.—Fourth session—Mr. Mitchel—deprived—bishop of Orkney's letter—submits, and is deposed.—Fifth session—more depositions—six Assemblies condemned.—Sixth session—absolved from their oaths—Dr. Hamilton deposed and deprived.—Seventh session—some acts passed.—Eighth session—bishop of Dunkeld abjures episcopacy—the bishops censured.—Ninth session—the lawfulness of episcopacy discussed—abjured—superintendents declared to be bishops.—Tenth session—Perth articles abjured—more bishops deposed.—Eleventh session—more bishops deposed—clergy deprived of their benefices.—Twelfth session—the apostacy of some of the bishops.—Thirteenth session—Henderson's sermon—bishops formally excommunicated—the sentence of excommunication.—Fourteenth session.—Fifteenth session—presbyterial courts of jurisdiction restored.—Sixteenth session—visitation of the universities.—Seventeenth session.—Eighteenth session.—Nineteenth session—moderator's congratulation at success.—The press fettered.—Rising of the Assembly.—A curse denounced on churchmen.—Some reflections.—Henderson's disclaimer.—Reflections.—Charge of immorality against the bishops.

1638.—From the prodigious influx of strangers to Edinburgh, the neighbouring country was unable to supply them with provisions; and they were therefore obliged to return to their own homes. But that their rebellion, under whatsoever name its atrocious guilt may be covered, might not suffer any diminution, four noblemen, four barons, four burgesses, and four ministers, were selected as committees, or, as they were denominated, TABLES, to treat as if they had been a lawful body with the privy council. Their numbers were afterwards doubled. Each of these orders sat at a table by themselves; and they formed a general table, at which their proceedings were debated before they were put in execution. There cannot be a doubt of the treachery of the privy council, which not only permitted this rebel government to start up, but actually entered into negociations with it, as if it had been an independent legal body.

Immediately on lord Traquair's return from court, contrary

to his duty as a privy councillor, he made known to the Tables the result of his communication with the king, and of his majesty's intentions towards the rebel government; by which means the Tables were enabled, without loss of time, effectually to counteract whatever measures the king might adopt. The archbishop of St. Andrews, lord chancellor of the kingdom, assembled the privy council at Stirling; and on the same day, at ten o'clock, read the king's proclamation at the market-cross, expressive of his majesty's pious intentions in the matter of the Liturgy and Book of Canons, promising a full pardon of all past offences, enjoining peaceable behaviour, and commanding all strangers to quit Stirling on six hours' notice, under pain of rebellion:—benevolently concluding, "that he would not shut his ears against any petition on that, or any other subject, provided that its matter and form be no way prejudicial to his royal authority." Here the deceived and betrayed monarch experienced an act of deliberate rebellion. The earls of Home and Lindsay, from the information previously communicated by Traquair to the Tables, had arrived in time to present a protest; in which, after denouncing the Liturgy and Canons as containing the seeds of superstition and popery, they ostentatiously exhibited their pretended grievances, and protested that "they would not be held liable in any pains, or penalties, or forfeitures, resulting from disobedience to any orders or proclamations in favour of the Book of Canons or Liturgy; that they would not be answerable for any consequences that might happen in enforcing these innovations; that they rejected the bishops as unjust judges, and that all their meetings and their petitions to the council are designed for no other end but to defend the purity of divine worship hitherto received, against the obtrusion of innovations, and the liberty of the church against the tyranny of the bishops; and that they have determined for prosecuting those sacred purposes to attend sober meetings of that kind; nor can they with a good conscience desist from them, unless they would be esteemed betrayers of the glory of God, the honour of the king, and the liberty of both church and state."

This protest was affixed to the market-cross, beside the royal proclamation. At Linlithgow and Edinburgh, where the king's proclamation was published, it was met by a counter protest; and a regular confederation was now formed to oppose the king's government. "By this protestation," says Stevenson, "the supplicants did convince the king and his council in earnest, *that they were too powerful*, and had more right (query,

might] on their side than to be compelled by arbitrary proclamations and orders of council; and as they were persuaded the king intended to surprise them, they were the more persuaded of the necessity of union among themselves, and therefore they resolved to renew the national covenant." Before night-fall Stirling was full of armed men, breathing defiance to the laws, and ready for any deed of violence in support of the rebellion. The bishop of Galloway was assaulted by the rabble in Stirling; and but for the intervention of the magistrates, would have been murdered. In passing Falkirk, he was attacked by the *pious* women with stones and filth, to the danger of his life. In Dalkeith he met with the same cruel usage. Three of the rioters were imprisoned, "so that the poor bishop was glad to become a kind of recluse, and shewed little of his old desire of martyrdom in this so good a cause[1]."

Had it not been for the politic caution of the chiefs, the infuriated rabble would have murdered good old archbishop Spottiswood;—it was certainly their intention to have done so. The proposal to imitate the murder of his predecessor Hamilton, was actually made, who, to the disgrace of the regent Lennox, was hanged in his episcopal robes in that same town.

After protesting, the noblemen and their followers, amounting to upwards of two thousand armed men, returned to Edinburgh, and consulted with Hope, the lord advocate. The Tables conducted their affairs with as much formality and authority as if the whole government of the kingdom had been legally in their possession. They issued orders and decrees, which were obeyed everywhere throughout the kingdom with more implicit submission and passive obedience than had ever been yielded to the lawful government of the sovereign; and they exercised a more intolerable tyranny over the loyal remnant than the most severe measures of which they themselves had ever had cause to complain[2].

Still acting on the advice of the lord advocate, the rebel Table chiefs framed their SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT on the model of the French Holy League. Cardinal Richlieu was the constant correspondent and supporter of these rebels, to whom he sent a copy of the Holy League; and his agents recommended it as the model for the Solemn League, which is

[1] Stevenson's Church and State, 204, 205.

[2] Arnot's Hist of Edinb. 111.—Guthry's Mem. 33.—Clarendon, i. 3.—Stevenson.

almost verbatim the same, changing only names and circumstances. The framers cunningly added the new League to the old covenant or confession of faith, sworn to by king James and his household, which, with its "abrenunciations and abhorrings, did so amaze" the rebels, and deceive the loyal and unwary, that they signed this most atrocious instrument of tyranny, in the opinion that it was merely a republication of the latter. "On the Sunday following, the whole strain of the ministers' discourses was calculated for convincing their hearers that the breach of king James's covenant had been a special cause of all the evils that were brought on them: and that the renovation of the same was a good mean for obtaining the Lord's special favour; and that for this they had many precedents in holy writ,—and to speak in the language of the General Assembly of 1640, The remembrance of their breach of covenant did sting, wound, and pierce through their consciences; wherefore, being moved with serious repentance, they resolved to renew their covenant or national confession[1]." To deceive the people they prefaced it with the bond, covenant, or negative confession, made in the late king's time against popery. To this they added a long and imposing array of acts of parliament, for the ratification of the protestant religion. Contrary to fact, they maintained that in that confession, the late changes in religion, caused by the Perth articles and liturgy, were *abjured* in that covenant as formally as if they had been expressly named in it.

This intolerant and persecuting covenant was prepared by Henderson and Johnston of Warriston, and revised by Balmerino, Loudon, and Rothes, from a copy of the French Holy League, furnished them by Cardinal Richlieu; which raised a terrible rebellion in France, under pretence of preserving religion, which desolated that whole kingdom. "And as that Holy League, which was worded for the preservation of the king's majesty's person and authority, in the preservation and defence of the Roman Catholic religion, did murder their king Henry III. who lived and died a zealous Roman Catholic, so the Scottish Solemn League, which was worded in the same manner, in defence of the king and the *protestant* religion, did murder king Charles I. who lived and died a *most zealous* protestant." These *pious* rebels called God to witness the sincerity of their loyalty to king Charles, at the very time when

[1] Stevenson's Church and State.

they were in actual rebellion against him, and were corresponding with the French king for assistance to dethrone him.

The Solemn League and Covenant is a most uncharitable, persecuting code—it sears the heart, and eradicates its generous emotions. With professions of loyalty ever on the lips, it inculcates rebellion, and that traitorous position "of distinguishing the authority and the persons of those placed in authority, as first principles:" yet, nevertheless, the author of *The Hind let Loose* calls it "our *magna charta* of religion and righteousness—our greatest security for all our interests." Its persecuting spirit is easily perceptible in the second and fourth sections, which are directed against the clergy; and, notwithstanding the liberality of the present day, the Solemn League and Covenant stands, in the Westminster Confession of Faith, a monument of a persecuting spirit. The fourth section, levelled at the laity, is equally of a persecuting nature, and decidedly establishes an inquisition; and, like the church from which they have copied so many of their worst principles, the malignants (that is, a loyal subject and an episcopalian) were first hunted out, and then handed over to the secular arm for condign punishment. The other publications of that time assert and maintain that rebellion was the avowed design of the Covenant; and the *Solemn and Seasonable Warning to all Ranks* says, that "the presbytery alone knows, and it only can determine, what the cause of God is; the king and parliament are not to be complied with but in subordination to the Covenant. . . . . The presbytery can counteract the acts of the estates of parliament, and discharge the subjects from obeying such acts as are imposed without the consent of the presbytery." This is exactly the language that the church of Rome applies to an heretical prince; and a celebrated authority of that church says, "If the civil laws infringe ecclesiastical immunity, or if they are in a matter in which the clergy are exempt from secular power, the clergy *are not bound* by such laws, either in their directive or in their compulsory force[1]." It then goes on to say, that "though our Saviour told his disciples that his kingdom was not of this world, and therefore they ought not to fight for him, yet that doctrine does not *now* oblige *covenanted* christians, for they may fight without, yea, and against, the consent of the supreme magistrate for the cause of God; and *a probable capacity* to effectuate their designs is the call of God to do it." One of the alleged causes of opposi-

[1] Den's Theology, ii. 292.

tion to the Liturgy was, that it had been imposed by the royal prerogative without the previous formality of an act of Assembly; but the Solemn League and Covenant was *forced* on the nation, at the instigation of a foreign jesuit, by a set of men who were in actual rebellion, and without the slightest sanction or authority of either the Assembly or the parliament.

On the 1st of March, the NATIONAL BAND OR COVENANT[1] was read publicly with great solemnity, and afterwards signed in the Greyfriars' churchyard, with uplifted hands, by the rebel nobility, gentry, presbyterian brethren, and commonalty. Henderson, who was formerly an episcopal clergyman, but who was now the leading man in the presbyterian party, had the audacity to offer up a prayer to Almighty God, that he would bless their rebellion (which He has declared to be as the sin of witchcraft) with success, and to prosper their crusade against His own institutions. The intolerant spirit of the COVENANTERS, as the rebels were now denominated, would admit of no refusal or evasion; they were all furnished with a copy of the Covenant, and empowered to administer it, and which they obliged every one they met to sign. In consequence of this violent zeal, many signed it without reflection: and, such was the frantic enthusiasm of some of the zealots, that they subscribed it with their own blood instead of ink. The city of ABERDEEN alone, honourably, and so successfully, resisted this covenant, that the famous Samuel Rutherford, (who says "he got a full answer of his Lord, to be a graced minister, and a chosen arrow hid in his quiver,") acknowledged, in his letter from that city to David Dickson,—"I cannot get a house in Aberdeen wherein to leave drink-siller in my Master's name save one only. There is no sale for Christ in the north; he is like to lay long on my hands ere any accept of him." Messrs. Boyd, Maxwell, and Bell, three of the clergy of Glasgow, had the courage also to resist the covenant, and to maintain the Perth articles. A deputation of covenanting ministers was sent to compel them to subscribe; "but no reasoning could move either of them from their opposition to the covenant, and so remove the stumbling-block out of the way of that people[2]."

Mr. Napier cites the following sentences of a letter from Mr. David Mitchell, one of the persecuted ministers of Edinburgh, to Dr. John Lesly, bishop of Raphoe, as affording a curious confirmation of the secret manner in which the covenant had been got up:—"The greater part of the kingdom have subscribed, and the rest are daily subscribing, *a covenant*. It is

[1] Vide post, vol. ii. Stevenson's Church and State.

the oath of the king's house 1580, with *strange additions;* a mutual combination for resistance of all novations in religion, doctrine, discipline, and rites of worship, that have been brought in since that time; so as if the least of the subscribers be touched,—and there be some of them *not ten years of age, and some not worth twopence*,—that all shall concur for their defence, and for the expulsion of all papists and adversaries (that is, *all that will not subscribe*) out of the church and kingdom, according to the laws, whereof an hundred are cited in the charter. This goes on apace. The [so-called] *true pastors* are brought into Edinburgh to cry out against *us wolves;* and they, with our brethren here, Mr. Andrew Ramsay, Mr. Henry Rollock, and your whilom friend the Principal [Adamson], crying out, that they are neither good christians, nor good subjects, that do not subscribe, nay, nor in covenant with God, have made us so odious, *that we dare not go on the streets.* I have been *dogged* by some gentlemen, and followed with many mumbled *threatenings* behind my back; and then, when in stairs, *swords drawn*, and '*If I had the papist villain, oh!*'—Yet, I thank God, I am living to serve God, and the king, and the church, and your lordship. Your chief [Rothes, whose family name is Lesly] is chief in this business. There is nothing expected here but civil war[1]."

Civil war did certainly very soon follow this unhappy covenant; and in the meantime it divided the nation into two parties—the rebels, who were to a man covenanters; and the loyal and gallant few who, in the midst of such universal rebellion, still clung to the throne and the altar. "Such," says the presbyterian Heron, "was the enthusiasm and frontless wickedness of the lawyers, that none of them could be persuaded to pronounce a covenant illegal, which had been framed in *defiance* of the executive government, and *in violation* of the existing laws, for the purpose of restoring an ecclesiastical anarchy utterly *incompatible* with all civil order. From the north of Ireland they invited home a reinforcement of zealous puritan divines, who proved afterwards the ablest and most active agitators in the cause of the Covenanters; for *only an inferior proportion, and these the weakest and most ignorant of the established clergy of the Scottish Church, had espoused the covenant* with a zeal sufficiently forward to win the confidence of the leaders of their party. Bands of missionaries were sent out through all parts of the kingdom, to win by persuasion and menaces new subscriptions to the covenant. The loyalty

[1] Montrose and the Covenanters, i. 157, 158.

and episcopal firmness of the members of the university of Aberdeen were alone assailed in vain. Henderson, Dickson, and Cant, with the earls of Montrose and Kinghorn, and the lord Cupar, had been sent against them. The logic of these missionaries of the covenant was readily baffled; their groaning, whining eloquence, was without difficulty withstood. The train of their measures was evinced to be *insurrection and conspiracy* against the king's authority. Their covenant was proved to be *without obligation;* because it was *illegal*, and aimed at ends incompatible with orderly government. Episcopacy was shown to be founded as strongly as presbytery upon the maxims of revelation, the practice of the primitive church, and the expediency of civil society. But the doctors of Aberdeen found that it was more easy to confute than to convince or silence the high priests of the covenant[1]."

When the archbishop of St. Andrews heard what was done, he said, "*Now all that we have been doing these thirty years past is thrown down at once;*" and justly fearing violence to his person from the atrocious fury of the rabble, he fled to London, where he soon after died.

Copies of the league were sent to all the presbyteries for signature, "few *daring*," says the covenanter Stevenson, "to shew their disinclination, and if any were so hardy, they were compelled by menaces and various injuries to embrace it, or otherwise were turned out of their pastoral cures, or other offices which they enjoyed." In consequence of the oath enjoined by the covenant for the extirpation of episcopacy, several of the presbyteries took upon them to ordain ministers, without the knowledge or consent of their respective bishops; and in those presbyteries where the covenanting mania was dominant, they removed their constant moderators. Many of the clergy saved their lives by flight from the fury of the covenanted rabble, and abandoned a country where neither their lives nor property were any longer safe. The whole kingdom was in a most fearful state of anarchy. The courts of justice had been closed for twelve months; many of the highland clans, taking advantage of this suspension of the laws, began to arm, and to plunder and oppress the peaceably inclined, and many murders were committed. The covenanters, especially the women, committed violent outrages against the loyal clergy for refusing to sign the covenant. Dr. Ogston, of Collinton, was furiously attacked in Edinburgh, by the covenanting amazons, because, having been translated from Aberdeen

[1] Heron's History of Scotland, v. 120, and 125, 126.

by bishop Forbes, his orthodoxy was *suspected*, and also because it was *suspected* he had spoken somewhat in favour of the Virgin Mary. Many others were attacked, whose lives were endangered by the ferocious zeal of the multitude inflamed by the persecuting tendency of the solemn league and covenant. These facts are confessed by one of the most devoted of the presbyterian authors[1].

The covenanters added the most disgusting hypocrisy to their tyranny. "All presbyterians," says Stevenson, "whose writings of that time we have seen, do bear witness, that a great measure of the Divine presence did remarkably accompany that solemn action, and that its happy influences were every where signally felt and seen; the covenanting work was accompanied with covenanting grace!" The Tables again went a little farther, and said, "That the Lord from heaven did testify his acceptance of that covenant, by the wonderful workings of his Spirit in the hearts of both pastors and people, to their great comfort and strengthening in every duty, above any measure that ever hath been heard of in this land[2]."

The Tables exerted their whole influence and ingenuity to prevent the peaceable accommodation of their imaginary complaints. The factious brethren thundered from the pulpits the most uncharitable accusations against Charles's sincerity, and denunciations of the wrath of heaven against whosoever should listen to his majesty's proposals, or renounce the covenant, which they reckoned perjury: but a false oath is not to be kept; it is to be repented of. The style of the popular oratory of the pulpits may be gathered from Samuel Rutherford's Letters, which speak out, in their own dialect, the spirit of the covenanters. "Go on," says he, "as ye have worthily begun, in purging of the Lord's house in this land, and pulling down the sticks of antichrist's foul nest: this wretched prelacy, and that black kingdom, whose wicked aims have ever been, and still are, to make this fat world the only compass they would have of faith and religion, to sail by, and to mount up the man of sin, their godfather, the pope of Rome, upon the highest stair of Christ's throne, and to make a velvet church. These men mind nothing else but that, by bringing in the pope's foul tail first upon us, their wretched and beggarly ceremonies, they may thrust in after them antichrist's legs, thighs, and his belly, head and shoulders; and then cry down Christ and his gospel, and put up the merchandise and wares of the great w——. Christ shall never be content with this land, neither

[1] Stevenson, 216, 217. [2] Stevenson's Hist. 210.

shall his hot fiery indignation be turned away, so long as the prelate (the man that lay in antichrist's foul womb, and the antichrist's lord bailiff) shall sit lord carver in Lord Jesus' courts. The prelate is both the egg and the nest to cleek and bring forth popery in; plead therefore for the pulling down of the nest, and crushing the egg. Let us not fear, he shall have his gospel once again *exposed to sale* in Scotland, and the matter go to voices, to see who will say, Let Christ be crowned king of Scotland! It is true, antichrist stirreth his tail; but I love a rumbling and a raging devil in the kirk, rather than a subtle or a sleeping devil[1]!" This inflammatory, rebellious pulpit oratory was assisted by pamphlets and resolutions, conveyed with industry to the most remote parts of the kingdom; arms and provisions were collected and stored for the bloody emergency which they contemplated, in their ferocious zeal for the "crowning king Jesus."

The council again met at Stirling, on the 10th of March, and sent up sir John Hamilton, lord justice clerk, to inform his majesty of the state of the kingdom. Justly alarmed at a rebellion and confederacy so general and extensive, the king resolved to send down the marquis of Hamilton as high commissioner, with full powers. Sir John Hamilton was sent down before him, with a letter to the council, requiring the lord treasurer, the lord privy seal, and the lord Lorn, to repair to court to give their advice. The two former remained at court, and came down with the commissioner, but lord Lorn returned hastily on the 20th of May, on account of advice tendered to the king by his father the earl of Argyle. The old earl recommended to his majesty to detain lord Lorn, and not suffer him to return to Scotland; for from his principles he assured the king that "he would wind him a pirn." The king thanked Argyle for his advice, but said, "he behoved to be a king of his word, and therefore having called him up by his warrant, he would not detain him[2]."

Rebellion was now so open and undisguised, that the king was advised to reduce the covenanters to obedience by the sword; but he determined on first trying the effects of an amicable negociation, and to send a commissioner with ample powers. His loyal advisers recommended the marquis of Huntly; but the faction with which he was surrounded succeeded in procuring the appointment of the marquis of Hamilton, "whose head," says Heylin, "was better than his heart,—

[1] Samuel Rutherford's Letters.
[2] Guthry's Memoirs, 51.

a notable dissembler, true only to his *own* ends, and a most excellent master in the art of insinuation; by which he screwed himself so far into his majesty's good opinion, that whosoever undertook the *unrivetting* of him, made him faster in it." . . . . . "This man, considering with himself that he was" [illegitimately] "descended from a daughter of king James II. (but without taking notice of any intervenient flaws which occurred in the pedigree), conceived by little and little that the crown would look as lovely upon his head as on the heads of any which descended from a daughter of James V." He conceived hopes for his ambition from the discontent of the nobility about the revocation of the grants of the church lands, and the factious conduct of the presbyterians and puritans in both kingdoms. He had spoken so imprudently of his propinquity to the crown, that one Ramsay openly drank his health as James the Seventh. Hamilton was jealous of the rising merits of Montrose and Huntly, and used some very disingenuous arts to prejudice Charles against both of these worthy noblemen. He assured Montrose, in order to excite his indignation, that the king was resolved to reduce Scotland to the form of a province; and he imposed on the king, by informing him that Montrose "proudly looked upon the crown," by reason of a family descent, and ought to be "nipped in the bud." This double dealing mutually estranged two generous hearts from each other for a brief period. But Huntly now stood in his way, and his friend, the duke of Lennox, recommended Hamilton so strongly (although he was "generally suspected to *betray* his master,") that Charles unfortunately appointed him lord high commissioner to represent his person in Scotland[1].

On Saturday, the 26th of May, Hamilton proceeded for Scotland, "and in a short time came to Dalkeith . . . . . where he reposed himself a while, and that he might make his entry into the city with the greater honour. After some *seeming* diffidences betwixt him and the covenanters, he puts himself into Holyrood House, where the first thing he did was the waving of his attendance at the reading of the English liturgy, which had been settled in the chapel-royal of that house by the late king James, anno 1617, and, after some neglects and intermissions, restored by the piety of king Charles, anno 1633, as before was signified. It was no hard matter to discern by his acts in this, whose game it was he

[1] Nalson's Collections.—Heylin's Life of Laud, pp. 347-350.—Vide *ante*, chap. ii. pp. 23, 24.

meant to play, for what it was that he had held the shuffling of the cards so long, and who was like to win the set, when none but he had the dealing of them: for he so plied the king from one time to another, sometimes by representing the extreme difficulties, and sometimes the apparent dangers, in which his affairs there stood involved, that he drew him to throw up all, in less than three months, which king James and he had been projecting above thirteen years[1]."

The marquis of Hamilton arrived at Berwick on the 3d of June, where he was met by the earl of Roxburgh, who informed him in what a state of agitation the people were. The next day the earl of Lauderdale and lord Lindsay waited on him. The latter informed him that they would never give up the covenant, but would have the Perth Articles abolished, and episcopacy limited to little more than a name. "If these points were not granted them, and a General Assembly and parliament not called quickly, they would call them themselves before the great crowds of Edinburgh were scattered." He also learnt that the covenanters were providing themselves with arms, and preparing to support their demands by force; of which he informed the king, and recommended him to be prepared for open rebellion[2].

A great multitude had assembled tumultuously in the capital, where all public and private business was entirely at a stand. Their appearance and attitude deterred the commissioner from entering Edinburgh, and in consequence he took up his residence at Dalkeith; but being entreated by the "Table" chiefs to remove to Holyrood House, he set out, accompanied by the privy council and such of the nobility as were still ostensibly faithful to their betrayed sovereign. He was met half way by the covenanters, on foot and on horseback, making an ostentatious display of their numbers. In this multitude there were a great number of the brethren, who had neglected the spiritual duties of their parishes, in their zeal for rebellion and "crowning of King Jesus;" one of whom offered to entertain the commissioner with a speech; but being well acquainted with the nature of their harangues, his grace declined their civility. After mutual compliments, the commissioner demanded in the king's name what they expected from his majesty in satisfaction of their complaints; at same time, he insisted that they should return to their obedience,

[1] Heylin's Life of Laud, 357.

[2] Burnet's Memoirs of the Duke of Hamilton, 52—54.

and renounce the covenant. In reply, the rebels demanded that a free General Assembly and parliament should be called. "It was absurd," they said, "to require a people to return to their obedience who had never departed from it, and they would *sooner renounce their baptism than abate one syllable of the covenant!*" Nay, so far were they from renouncing this engine of rebellion and blood, that they invited the king's representative to sign it! and to such a fury had they lashed up the sectarian and vicious passions of the people, that, although the Book of Common Prayer had been read constantly in the chapel-royal for upwards of twenty years, they notified to the commissioner, that if it should be read there for the time to come, the officiating clergyman should *suffer death at their hands*,—a convincing proof of covenanting intolerance!

The commissioner recalled the court of session to Edinburgh; but it was immediately demanded that he should discharge sir Robert Spottiswood the president, and sir John Hay the lord-register, on account of their fidelity to the king and attachment to the church. The commissioner, however, refused to grant this unreasonable demand. On the 4th of July he published his majesty's proclamation at the Cross, in which he declared the king's "resolution to maintain the true protestant religion, and that he never intended to press the canons and service-book, but in such a legal way as might be agreeable to all his loving subjects, and therefore warned them all to beware of disobedience." The proclamation was immediately met by a protest, which was read by ARCHIBALD JOHNSTON, OF WARRISTON, in the name of the associated lords[1]. On the 28th June, Hamilton suspended the execution of the canons and liturgy, discharged all the acts of council made for their establishment, and promised to regulate the high commission in such a manner as that the captious covenanters should not have any cause to complain.

In this outrageous state of popular excitement, the commissioner did not think it safe to remain; he therefore posted back to London for fresh instructions, and returned to Edinburgh with as little effect as formerly, for the more the king conceded, the higher the rebels rose in their demands. He returned a second time to London, and came back empowered to make still more ample concessions, which only served to increase the demands of the covenanters, who evidently aimed

[1] Memoirs of the Duke of Hamilton, 54.—Stevenson's Ch. and State, 234.—Balfour's Annals, 276.

at wresting the whole power out of Charles's hands[1]. The earls of Rothes, Cassillis, and some others, wrote to the noblemen at court, who were in their interest, and enclosed a copy of "Articles for the present peace of the kirk and kingdom of Scotland," wherein they demand that the service-book, book of canons, and court of high commission, the Perth articles, and the bishops' vote in parliament, should be discharged; that all presentations to benefices be directed to presbyteries in all time coming, with full power to give collation thereupon, they being the lawful office-bearers in the kirk: that a lawful and free national Assembly of this kirk, warranted by *divine authority*, be called: and, lastly, that a parliament be summoned for redress of grievances![2] On his arrival at court, Burnet says that the marquis gave his majesty a full account of the strength and fury of the covenanters, and of the suspicious conduct of the privy council. He also assured his majesty that the people's credulity was abused, and their prejudices excited, by the insinuations of their leaders that his majesty was prepared to embrace the popish religion. As an antidote he advised him to renew the Confession of Faith, which was established at the reformation, and ratified in parliament in 1567; to which the king readily consented[3]. His grace returned to Dalkeith with instructions to command the council and officers of government to sign it; and if they signed it, he was empowered to call a General Assembly, but with the express proviso that the bishops should sit and vote in it, and that the moderator should be a bishop. He agreed that the Perth articles be held as indifferent; that ministers be admitted as before the late commotions, and that no other oaths be imposed upon them than were warranted by act of parliament; that he should protest against abolishing the bishops, and give way to as few restrictions on their power as possible; that he might yield to their being accountable to the Assembly, but not to permit the Assembly to challenge their precedence.

During the marquis's absence at court, the covenanters were remarkably active in traversing the kingdom, and procuring subscriptions to the covenant. Aberdeenshire, and the northern parts generally, continued firm in their religious and political allegiance; and it became therefore necessary to indoctrinate the people in those parts with the anti-church and anti-monarchical principles of the covenant. Henderson, Dickson, and

[1] Burnet's Mem.—Baillie.—Arnot's Hist. of Ed.—Guthry's Mem.
[2] Stevenson's Church and State.
[3] Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton, 65.

Cant, were therefore sent to Aberdeen, and arrived there on the 23d of July; where, says Burnet, "there was a company of worthy and learned doctors." But their welcome there was so indifferent, that they were not permitted to preach in any of the churches, and they were obliged to deliver their discourses in the square of Marischal College. They only gained about nineteen subscriptions, and found the people generally hostile to the object of their mission; and they went away full of threats and fury against the city of Aberdeen. There was a public disputation between the doctors of Aberdeen and the missionaries of the covenant, which resulted in the utter overthrow of the latter.

On the 8th of August, the commissioner returned from court, and declared in council, that he had obtained his majesty's permission to summon a parliament and an Assembly, provided the covenanters would agree to some reasonable terms of compromise; and negociations were entered into with them to dispose them for some concessions, but all in vain. The covenanters *claimed every thing*, but *would yield nothing*. They would not admit that the king and the loyalists could possess either honour or conscience, and every thing must yield to their bigotry and intolerance; but the audacity of their claims is not to be wondered at, when it is now ascertained that they were secretly encouraged by those very councillors by whom his majesty was served.

As the rebels would not yield one jot of their pretensions, the commissioner informed the Tables, that his instructions did not permit him to call a parliament or Assembly till the king was farther advised, and therefore desired till the 20th of September to go to London and consult the king's pleasure. The Tables *condescended* to allow his grace the necessary time, on condition that there should be no more delays! which shows that they exercised an independent sovereign power. That the privy council permitted these Tablers to grow up with impunity, and to treat with, and dictate to, their sovereign, is an undeniable evidence of the traitorous materials of which it was composed. In the interval, pamphlets were published, asserting the independence of the General Assembly on the sovereign, and of their power of meeting and legislating without his permission, with the view of preparing the godly brethren, who, after all, were mere tools in the hands of the lords of the Tables, to meet in Assembly against the sovereign's will, in case he should refuse.

The commissioner returned on the 17th of September, and having by his majesty's command signed the original covenant

and band of 1580, the privy council were enjoined to do the same, and all loyal subjects were required to do so likewise. On his journey down, he met some of the Scottish bishops at Ferrybridge, to whom he communicated his majesty's intentions; which gave them much uneasiness, and against which they vehemently objected. They determined, however, to attend the Assembly, and in the interim to send one of their number to court. The covenanters used every effort to counteract his majesty's intentions; and railed incessantly on the negative confession, as tending to subvert the religion and liberty of the nation, and *to introduce popery*. Now, their forefathers signed it *as an antidote to popery*; yet, with a strange inconsistency, they found it convenient to prefix this very covenant or confession to their own Solemn League, which, they said, they preferred to the regenerating sacrament of baptism! On his arrival, the marquis discovered the commencement of jealousies betwixt some of the moderate ministers and the lords of the covenant, respecting the lay elders. Burnet says, he endeavoured by all means to increase the division, and represented to the ministers the danger which they incurred from the inordinate ambition of the lay elders, who would in the end reduce the ministers to a greater slavery than they had any reason to fear from either the king or the bishops. He found that the covenanters were ready to have convened an Assembly of their own authority, if he had procrastinated any longer; and therefore he thought it expedient to summon one himself immediately on the royal authority[1]. He, therefore, on the 9th of September, made a proclamation at the market-cross, discharging the use of the liturgy, the book of canons, and the court of high commission, the Perth articles, and generally rescinding all deeds whatsoever that had been made for establishing them, although they had been ratified both by acts of Assembly and parliament. At the same time he summoned a General Assembly to meet at Glasgow, on the 21st of November, and a parliament to sit at Edinburgh, on the 15th of May next year[2].

"CHARLES, &c.

"Forasmuch as the cause of all the distractions which have happened of late, both in church and commonwealth, have proceeded from the conceived fears of innovation of religion and laws, to free all our good subjects of the least suspicion of such intention in us, and to satisfy not only their

[1] Burnet's Memoirs, &c. lib. ii. 29. [2] Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 351.

desires but even their doubts, we, by these presents, *do discharge* the service-book, book of canons, and high commission, and the practice of these; and by these presents rescind all acts of council, proclamation, and other acts and deeds that have been made or published for establishing any of them, and declare the same to have no force in time coming. And being informed that the urging of the five articles of the Perth Assembly hath bred great distraction in the church and state, we have been graciously pleased to take the same into our consideration; and for the quiet and peace of the church and state, do not only dispense with the practice of the said articles, but also discharge all persons from urging the practice thereof upon either laic or ecclesiastical person; and we do hereby free all our subjects from censure or pain, ecclesiastical or seculiar, for not urging, practising, or obeying the same. And because it hath, to the disgrace of government, been surmised, that some of our subjects have exercised unwarranted power, and held themselves eximed from censure and punishment, to which others are liable, we declare, that if any of our subjects have, or shall at any time presume to do any such act, or assume to themselves any such exemption or power, that they shall be liable to the trial and censure of any judicatory competent, according to the quality and nature of the offence. For the free entry of the ministers, it is our will that no other oath be administrate to them than that which is contained in the act of parliament. And to give our subjects full assurance that we never intend to admit of any change in the true religion already established and professed in this our kingdom; and that all our good people may be fully satisfied of our intention towards the maintenance of the said religion; we, by these presents, command all the lords of our privy council, senators of the College of Justice, judges, and magistrates in burgh and land, and all our other subjects whatsoever, to subscribe and renew the Confession of Faith, subscribed at first by our dear father and his household in the year 1580, thereafter by persons of all ranks in the year 1581, by ordinance of the secret council and acts of the General Assembly; subscribed again by all sorts of persons in the year 1590, by a new ordinance of council, at the desire of the General Assembly, with a general band for maintenance of the true religion and the king's person. And for that effect we do require the lords of council to take such course concerning the foresaid confession and general band, that it may be subscribed and renewed through the whole kingdom with all possible diligence. And because we will not leave in our subjects' minds the least doubt of our real

resolutions, we have given warrant to our commissioner to indict a free General Assembly, to be holden at Glasgow, the 21st day of November in this present year 1638, and thereafter a parliament, to be holden at Edinburgh the 15th day of May, 1639, for settling a perfect peace in the church and kingdom. And because it is likely that the distractions that happened of late have been occasioned through the conceived fears of innovation of religion and laws, and not out of any disloyalty or disaffection to sovereignty, *we are graciously pleased, absolutely to forget and forgive all bygones to all such as shall acquiesce in this our gracious pleasure, and carry themselves peaceably*, and shall ratify the same in our ensuing parliament. And, that this Assembly may have the better success and more happy conclusion, our will is, that there be a solemn fast proclaimed, and kept by all our good subjects of this kingdom, fourteen days before the said Assembly, for begging a blessing on that Assembly, and a peaceable end to the distractions of this church and kingdom, with the aversion of God's heavy judgment from both."

The religious and moderate among the covenanters were rejoiced at Charles's gracious intentions, which, in fact, deprived them of all *real cause* of complaint, and brought all their differences to a point. But the Table lords were of a different mind. They met the proclamation, as usual, with a protest, denouncing the king's concessions as full of deceit, and otherwise unsatisfactory; and it is painful to see the illustrious name of Montrose appended to this protest. The covenanters advised their confidants in all parts of the country, with all possible expedition to warn every presbytery and congregation within their bounds to abstain from subscribing the new confession; and that wherever the king's proclamation should be read, as many covenanters as could be collected should meet and protest against it. The whole nation, however, was not so besotted with covenanting fanaticism, but that, in spite of their malignant arts and menaces, 28,000 persons in Edinburgh, who had not bowed the knee to the Solemn League, signed the covenant promulgated by the court. On the following Sunday, the pulpits in the presbyterian interest resounded with virulent invectives against the king's proclamation and the subscription of the old covenant. They denounced it as "the depth and policy of the devil;" while, in their prayers, they begged of God "to

[1] Stevenson's Church and State, 256.—Burnet's Memoirs, lib. ii. 81.—Balfour's Annals, ii. 293.—Guthry's Memoirs, 37.

scatter them in Jacob, and divide them in Israel, who had been the authors of that scattering and divisive counsel." Wherever the proclamation was published before the Edinburgh club of seditious covenanters had time to poison the minds of the people against it, it was generally received with all joy and thanksgiving. At Glasgow, in particular, it met with such a cordial reception, that the provost and town council, and the principal and professors of the university, with the city clergy, wrote letters to the council expressive of their highest satisfaction at his majesty's clemency and fatherly care of his people. In his perplexity the king required the opinions of the law officers of the crown respecting the legality of the covenanters' proceedings, of their convening without the royal authority, protesting against his proclamations, and entering into a combination or covenant without his knowledge or concurrence. Sir Thomas Hope, the lord advocate, and Sir Lewis Stewart, gave their opinions, "that the most part of the covenanters' proceedings were warranted by law: and that, though *in some things* they seem to have *exceeded*, yet there was no express law against them;" "an opinion," says Stevenson, "that could give no satisfaction to his majesty, and in which it was not doubted the two last had crossed their inclination: but their solid judgment, and deep knowledge of the law, would not allow them to say otherwise; and for the former, it was shrewdly suspected that *the covenanters had hitherto acted by his advice in the most intricate steps of their management*[1]."

The *Tablers* determined to pack the Assembly with their own partizans, and they took the utmost pains to exclude the moderate clergy who were inclined to peace, and willing to be satisfied with his majesty's late concessions. To prevent the bishops, who were constitutional members, from attending in their places, the Table chiefs appointed the several presbyteries to summon them to answer to criminal charges that were got up for that especial occasion, but which had no foundation whatever in truth.

They issued mandates to the presbyteries, to return two or at most three ministers each, and to take especial care that these should be of the "sincerer sort;" and, as for the ruling elders, to return only one for each presbytery, with peremptory orders that he should be some "well affected" nobleman or gentleman on whom they could rely, and who was to have an equal vote with the ministers in the choice of their member for the Assembly. The ministers, even those who were thoroughly

[1] Stevenson's Church and State, p. 213.

imbued with covenant principles, at first strongly opposed this step, which would bring them more completely under subjection to the lay elders than ever they had been to the bishops. But they were persuaded by the plausible argument, that the noble lay elders, being hereditary members of parliament, would more readily agree to ratify those acts of Assembly in parliament, which they themselves had assisted to pass in the Assembly. The necessity of unity was also urged; but where the ministers stood out against these arguments, then the lay elders forced themselves into the presbyteries, and gave their votes as they had been instructed by the Tables at Edinburgh. The greater part of the Assembly, therefore, consisted of those who were irregularly chosen by the overwhelming voice of the lay-elders which were thrust upon them, or else of those who were not capable of being elected, being then under the censures of the church of Scotland or of Ireland, or who had not taken the oath of supremacy according to law. In the greatest number of the presbyteries the lay-elders, according to instructions from the Tablers, chose the members for the Assembly, and thereby procured a considerable majority of the fiercest and most rigid Covenanters[1]. At no period had either the king or the bishops ever attempted such a tyrannical thraldom on the presbyteries as this despotism that was now exercised by the Tables, but with which the presbyterians now cheerfully complied.

In consequence of these arts, the most furious and bigoted lay-elders and ministers were sent up to the Assembly; and to call it *free* is an absolute mockery, and shows the revolution of opinions that circumstances had effected. This Assembly laid the foundation of the presbyterian establishment, and, therefore, it has been lauded and magnified as the basis of civil and religious freedom, although no author has ever had the hardihood to deny the unconstitutional arts to which the Tablers resorted, in order to pack this Assembly to serve their own revolutionary views. To cast a note of infamy on the bishops, and so to exclude them from their seats in the Assembly, the Tablers accused each individual bishop of being guilty of "excessive drinking, whoring, gaming, profanation of the Lord's day, contempt of public ordinances and family-worship, mocking at preaching, prayer, and spiritual conference; as also of bribery, simony, dishonesty, perjury, oppression, adultery, and incest, and *suspicion* of Arminianism, popery, and card-playing[2]." This sweeping and improbable charge was read in

[1] Skinner's Eccles. Hist. ii. 321.

[2] Stevenson.—Guthry's Memoirs.

all the churches in Edinburgh immediately after the celebration of the communion; and the prayers and thanksgivings usual after it were omitted, to make way for the above indecent and calumnious libel. This proceeding shows the malignity that actuated their hearts, when they would rather dispense with the service of God than not glut their own malice, and inflame the sectarian and seditious spirit of the wretched people. All the presbyteries, by instructions from the Tables, served the above libel upon the bishops, and cited them to appear at the General Assembly, to undergo trial and censure. The Tables sent orders throughout the whole kingdom to search into the bishops' conversations; so that all their frailties and infirmities of temper being collected, and witnesses cited to the Assembly, they might find pretexts of justice to execute their vengeance on them. It was late on Saturday before the marquis heard that this calumnious libel was to be read the following day. He immediately issued an order to forbid the reading of it under the pain of treason; but this pain had now lost its terror, and besides the king was now unable to put it in execution[1].

The chief effort of their malignity was directed against that eminent father of the church, archbishop Spottiswood; and they directed the infamous libels against him and the other bishops to be read publicly in all the churches throughout the kingdom. One instance may serve for the whole. Colin Adams, minister of Kilrenny, in the county of Fife, read the libel from his pulpit. Mr. Beaton, of Balfour, who was present, was astonished to hear the archbishop of St. Andrews accused so summarily of the crimes of adultery, incest, drunkenness, sabbath-breaking, murder, infanticide, and a multitude of other crimes and misdemeanors. He had lived many years in his immediate neighbourhood, and had been admitted to much of his society and intimacy, yet he had never been able to discover that he was addicted to any of those crimes now laid to his charge. But his surprise and indignation were immeasurably increased when, as the minister read on, Beaton heard himself named as one of the *witnesses* who, it was said, had been examined on oath before the privy council, and had deposed to these crimes; and that, upon *his sworn* information, these charges had been made against the archbishop. It was notorious to all present, that Beaton had never been out of the parish, far less to have been at Edinburgh, and to have given evidence before the privy council. After the service he challenged Adams for having proclaimed what he himself must have known

[1] Burnet's Memoirs, lib. ii. 88, 89.

was a notorious falsehood. Adams acknowledged that he knew both to be altogether untrue; but that he was obliged to read the charges in obedience to the authority of the privy council, who would have visited his disobedience with summary vengeance[1]. From this one sample may be seen how much the history of that period has been falsified to serve a particular purpose; and the truth of king Charles's assertion cannot be denied, wherein he desires "to observe their proceedings in one process, which we are confident was framed and pursued with such malice, injustice, falsehood, and scandal, not only to the reformed religion in particular, but to the Christian religion in general, as it cannot be paralleled for any precedent of injustice in preceding ages, nor (we hope) shall ever be followed in future: and which, if it were known among Turks, pagans, or infidels, would make them abhor the Christian religion, if they did think it would either countenance or could consort with such abominable impiety and injustice[2]."

Advantage was taken of an hysterical girl, who pretended, and was believed, to be a prophetess, to laud their abominable idol the Covenant, which she alleged she was assured, by inspiration, was ratified in heaven; whereas, she was taught to say, that the king's covenant (which was prefixed to the *inspired* one) was the devil's invention! She was the oracle of the party, and she usually denominated our Saviour the "Covenanting Jesus." When Rollock, one of the covenanting ministers, was requested to pray with her, he said, "It would be unmannerly in him to speak, while his master, Christ, was speaking in her!" The senseless ravings of this insane fanatic were imputed to the operations of the Holy Spirit,—her impious, blasphemous prophecies, as the oracles of truth[3]."

At this time the jesuits reaped a rich harvest, and were remarkably active in Scotland. One of their number, Abernethy, forged a story, that the Scottish liturgy had been sent to Rome, to be seen and approved by the pope and his cardinals previous to publication, and that a Signior Con had actually shown it to him there. On hearing of this report, the commissioner wrote to Signior Con, who was then at London, to inquire into the truth of the jesuit's story. Con in reply said, till he came to London he had never so much as heard that there had been a liturgy proposed for Scotland, and had never seen Abernethy but once in his whole life. This did not prevent Abernethy's

[1] Account of the present Persecution, &c. letter iii.
[2] Large Declaration, p. 207.
[3] Burnet's Memoirs.—Arnot's Hist. of Edinburgh.

story from gaining extensive belief and a welcome hearing. Even Baillie seems to have been deceived by this man; who, he says, "hearing at Rome of God's wonderful work in Scotland, his conscience awakened on him, and he came home to Scotland, where he had not been long till he was persuaded of the truth of the report, and earnestly sought to be admitted a member of the reformed church, which was granted. After a sermon . . . . Mr. Abernethy did make a very sweet discourse, which is also printed, of his errors and reclaiming by the grace of God, with which, and the very penitent frame he was in at the time, the most of his hearers were affected even to tears. Thereafter *he subscribed the covenant, and did speak much in commendation of it;* and, after all our diligence to try, we can find no appearance of hypocrisy in him[1]." He seems to have been but a clumsy, though evil designed, jesuit; for Burnet says, the lightness and weakness of the man became afterwards visible, and small account was made either of him or his story, which at this time took wonderfully[2].

An unsuccessful attempt was made in the council, by those in the covenanting interest, to have it declared, "that matters of discipline and ceremonies were *points of faith*." Hamilton wrote to the marquis of Huntly, and to all the king's friends, to see that his majesty's proclamation was faithfully published; and to the clergy and professors of Aberdeen, intreating them to attend the Assembly, and support the church and the crown with the strength of their arguments. When he discovered the tyrannical edicts of the Tables, he drew up and circulated a strong remonstrance against the lay-elders; but these precautions were of no avail, for he had unfortunately allowed the Tables to anticipate him[3].

As the time approached for the meeting of the Assembly, the Tables fell on a plan to secure the attendance of an armed force to back their measures, without exciting suspicion. They circulated a report that an attack was meditated on the members of Assembly in their journey to Glasgow; and they afterwards recommended to all who were zealous in the cause to accompany their ministers in arms, and guard them during the sitting of the Assembly[4]. The utmost care was taken of the elections; and the ruling elders, being all men of power and influence, and besides engaged in a common cause of solution, equalled the ministers in numbers before the election, but exceeded them when votes were taken, because the can-

[1] Baillie's Letters. [2] Burnet's Mem.—Stevenson's Church and State.
[3] Burnet's Memoirs, lib. ii. 84. [4] Ibid. lib. ii. 84, 85, 86.

didates, which amounted sometimes to as many as six or eight, were removed while the election was pending. By this means, the Tablers, which regulated all the elections, procured the choice of such ministers only as suited their purposes. With all these precautions to ensure success, the Assembly duly met, and sat down on the 21st of November.

The commissioner also made great exertions to procure subscriptions to the confession, which many signed cheerfully, where he had the first advantage. A reaction began to take place, which, when the covenanters observed, they spread sinister reports, and created jealousies of the king's intentions. They asserted that his condescension was merely temporary, and intended to cajole them till he found himself strong enough to crush their liberties, and to introduce popery; and they added many reasons to persuade men that they incurred the guilt of perjury by signing the king's confession. The marquis of Huntly was the most successful of any of the king's friends, especially at Aberdeen, where the bishop and clergy signed, at the same time giving a paper containing seven restrictions, which are creditable to the memory of Dr. Adam Bellenden, bishop of Aberdeen, his clergy, and the other most worthy and excellent opponents of the prevailing heresy. Had all the clergy stood as firm as these illustrious men, the atrocious guilt which the possessors of the church's property brought on the nation might have been avoided. "But," says Burnet, with great truth and justice, "the *sins* of Scotland being *so great*, that they were to be punished with a tract of bloody civil wars, God, in his holy and wise judgments, permitted the poor people to be so blind in their obedience to their leaders, that *these arts* took universally with them; to which may justly be imputed all the mischiefs that kingdom has smarted under ever since[1]."

1st. "We do heartily abhor and condemn all errors *truly* popish, or repugnant to the Holy Scriptures, and consequently to the uniform doctrine of the reformed kirks, and to our national confession, registered in parliament anno 1567. 2dly. We do noways hereby abjure or condemn episcopal government, as it was in the days, and after the days of the apostles, in the christian kirk for many hundreds of years, and is now, conform thereto, restored to the kirk of Scotland. 3dly. We do not hereby condemn nor abjure the Five Perth Articles, or any thing lawful of that sort, which shall be found by the church conducible at any time for good policy and

[1] Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton, lib. ii. 85, 86.

order, or which is practised by any sound reformed kirk. 4thly. We still hold to that clause of our great national confession (chap. xx. art. 21), that the general councils, and consequently the national kirk of Scotland, have no power to make any perpetual law which God before hath not made. 5thly. By the adhering to the discipline of the reformed kirk of Scotland, we mean not any immutability of that presbyterial government which was, anno 1581, or of any other human institution: but we do hereby understand that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction and discipline of the kirk of Scotland doth not depend on the pope of Rome, or any other foreign power; and hereby we do confess our constant obedience to the kirk of Scotland in all her lawful constitutions. 6thly. We do not presume by this our personal oath either to prejudge the liberty of the kirk of Scotland to change and reform this aforesaid short confession, in some ambiguities and obscure expressions thereof, whereupon some men have builded inconvenient interpretations and doctrines, or to exime ourselves from obedience to the kirk in that case. 7thly, By this our personal oath we do not take upon us to lay any farther bond upon our posterity than the word of God doth, recommending only our example to them, so far as they shall find it agreeable to God's word. In this sense, as is said, and no otherwise, do we subscribe the said confession, and the general bond annexed thereunto, at Aberdeen, October 5, 1638.——(Signed), Adam, Aberdonen., John Forbes, D.D. and Prof. of Divinity; R. Barron, D.D. and Prof. of Divinity; Al. Rosse, D.D.; James Sibbald, D.D.; Al. Scrogie, D.D.; William Leslie, D.D.

When the lord commissioner arrived at Glasgow, he found the greatest number of people collected there that had ever previously been seen in that city. "The day being come, Hamilton marcheth to the place appointed for the session, in the equipage of a high commissioner, the sword and seal being carried before him, the lords of the council and all the officers of state attending on him like a king indeed[1]." Some difficulty in point of form was experienced, in consequence of the length of time which had elapsed since the last Assembly that had been held, as there was not a moderator to open the present meeting and preside in it, according to custom, till a new one should be elected. By a sort of mutual agreement betwixt the chiefs of the lay members of the Assembly and the commissioner, Mr. John Bell, one of the ministers of Glasgow, was appointed to preside till the moderator was chosen; and he

[1] Heylin's Life of Laud, 352.

accordingly opened the convocation with a sermon. We are told by Bishop Burnet, that "the marquis judged it was a hard sight to see such an Assembly, *for not a gown was among them all, but many had* SWORDS *and* DAGGERS *about them!*" An ominous sight, and pregnant with the calamities, which, for the sins of a guilty nation, were fast falling on the church. Presbytery has always "come out with swords and with staves" against the church, as Judas and the soldiers came against Christ her head; but we are told that "all they that take the sword," without warrant, "shall perish with the sword."

The first session was chiefly consumed in formalities. There were two hundred and sixty commissioners, consisting of an equal number of each, of ministers and lay-elders. Besides, there were from every presbytery from two to four lay assessors, who were not members, and had no vote; but their business was to give advice to the members, so that the number was very considerable; and none were admitted into the meeting except by a leaden token, as a sure sign of his being a covenanter, and the gates were securely guarded by the town officers. The brutal conduct of the people which got in by tokens, as good revolutionists, was such as to call for the pointed rebuke of the presbyterian Baillie:—"It is here alone," he says, "where I think we might learn from Canterbury, yea, from the pope, from the Turks or Pagans, modesty of manners; at least, their deep reverence in the house they call God's ceases not till it has led them to the adoration of the timber and stones of the place. We are here so far the other way, that our rascals, without shame, in great numbers, make such din and clamour in the house of the true God, that if they minted [attempted] to use the like behaviour in my chamber, I should not be content till they were down the stairs[1]."

The commissioner opened the meeting with a speech from the throne; and then desired the king's letter to be read on the second session. The Assembly were then proceeding to elect a moderator, but to this the commissioner objected, till the bishop's declinature was first read, which the Assembly flatly refused to do, alleging that the meeting must first be constituted, before they could consider any business. He protested against this procedure; but they had pre-determined to follow their own system, without paying any regard to the royal authority. Mr. Bell, the temporary moderator, signified his earnest desire that the moderator should be chosen, and

[1] Baillie's Letters, i. 123-4.

in the interim the commissioner sent to the castle of Glasgow, where the archbishop of Glasgow and the bishops of Ross and Brechin had taken shelter from the furious mob, to consult them how he should proceed. Their counsel was, to insist on the king's letter being read before they chose a moderator; and they were decidedly of opinion that the bishop's declinature should be read *before* the Assembly was constituted, because afterwards it could not be so properly received. "This," says the bishop of Ross, who wrote to the commissioner, "will manifest to all his majesty's pious intentions, evidence your grace's sincere affection to religion and the kingdom, preserve our right, make them inexcusable, let the people see how unreasonable and immoderate they are, and give to your grace a fair way and ground to discontinue and discharge the meeting, under pain of treason[1]."

On the second session the meeting again attempted to elect their moderator, when the commissioner demanded that the king's letter should be read, which was accordingly done; the purport of which was to recount the king's concessions, and his anxious desire to restore the peace of the church, and requiring the Assembly to give the same reverence and obedience to JAMES, MARQUIS OF HAMILTON, his commissioner, as if he himself were personally present, and promising to ratify whatever his said commissioner should offer in his name. The commissioner now required that the commissions of the ministers and elders should be examined, that those who had been irregularly elected might be deprived of their seats. This wise measure would have proved fatal to the whole covenanting cause, and it was therefore strongly resisted. His grace then retired into the chapter-house to consult with his council, and on his return he agreed to permit the election of their moderator, under protest that it should not prevent the examination of the commissions, or import his allowing any one who was irregularly sent up to be considered a member of the Assembly. He again, however, urged the reading of the bishop's protest before the election, which being rudely refused, he commanded it in the name of the king to be read. "But on a sudden there arose a tumultuous clamour, crying, 'no reading, no reading,' which did farther incense his lordship, and was displeasing to most of the members. This outcry being hushed, the lord commissioner did protest that their refusal to hear that paper was unjust, and that it was injurious to call the archbishops and bishops *pretended*, while the acts of parliament authorised

[1] Burnett's Memoirs, lib. ii. 97-98.

them. Against which the delegates from the presbyteries did also protest, that the bishops behoved to be taken for *protested*, till the Assembly should try the challenges which were given in against them, but promised, at the same time, that so soon as a moderator was chosen, any paper which his grace desired to be read, should be heard[1]."

His grace's efforts were of no avail. ALEXANDER HENDERSON, minister of Leuchars, near St. Andrews, was chosen moderator; a man of great ability, and well fitted for the office to which he had been from the first designed. The marquis then desired that his assessors, the earls of ARGYLE, formerly lord Lorn, Traquair, Roxburghe, Lauderdale, and Southesk, and sir Lewis Stewart, the deputy lord advocate, might be permitted to vote as members, which was refused; but he protested against their decision. This completed the second session. The commissioner seemed to be a timid irresolute man, and not fitted, by decision of character or energy of action, for the place which had been assigned to him by the misplaced favour and affection of his sovereign.

November 23, third session.—The first proceeding was to elect a clerk, although Mr. Sandilands, the commissary of Aberdeen, held the office by patent; but it was necessary to have a clerk in harmony with the majority of the Assembly, and one who was deep in the secrets of those who pulled the wires. Reasons are never wanting in a popular Assembly to authorize any act of injustice, however flagrant; and so, on this occasion, neither the commissioner's protest, nor Mr. Sandiland's spirited remonstrance, had any effect. He was dismissed, and ARCHIBALD JOHNSTON, OF WARRISTON, was chosen clerk, to whom Mr. Sandilands, the former clerk, delivered up the minutes of former Assemblies, from the year 1590 to 1618. After *assuming*, but without proof, that the archbishop of St. Andrews had destroyed some of the registers, and interpolated others, Johnston produced five MS. books, which he averred were the true and authentic registers which were said to be wanting, and which exactly fitted into the period of which the true registers would have given a very different account. A committee was immediately formed, to examine them and report; and the commissioner, as usual, contented himself with a protest. Johnston had himself prepared these spurious volumes, and the Assembly declared that *they were the original registers of the church*, although they had never been heard of till he produced them for party pur-

[1] Stevenson's Church and State, p. 279.—Burnet's Memoirs.

poses. The Assembly "attested before God, and declared to the world, that these registers are famous, authentic, and good registers, which ought to be so reputed, and have public faith in judgment, and outwith the same, as valid and true records in all things; and with that report a paper was given in, containing nineteen reasons, proving the said registers to be authentic." The moderator then proposed that the commissions should be examined; but the commissioner required that the bishop's protest should be first read, and directed that Dr. Hamilton, rector of Glassford, might be heard read it, now that the objections respecting a moderator and clerk were removed. It was peremptorily refused till after the commissions had been examined and the Assembly fully constituted. The commissioner protested that the not reading of that paper before trying the commissions should infer no prejudice to the lords of the clergy and their adherents[1].

Saturday, the 24th of November.—The fourth session was entirely occupied in examining the validity of the different commissions; and an attempt was made to induce the commissioner to permit the business of the Assembly to proceed in his absence, and which should be reported to him daily. To this his grace decidedly objected, alleging that "he was sent there by his majesty to attend to this business alone; so it behoved him to be an eye and ear witness of all that passed, that his account might be the more faithful[2]."

The fifth session of this Assembly met on Monday, the 26th of November, at the commencement of which the Rev. Thomas Mackenzie presented a protest from the chanonry of Ross against lay elders and the Tables at Edinburgh, but which was summarily rejected. "And now the commissions being discussed, the moderator reported the same, with a remark on the singular favour of God towards the Assembly in vouchsafing them peace and liberty to treat of all such matters as should come before them, and recommended to them, as the next and only preparatory step remaining, to clear the authenticity of the registers, and that the committee named would bring in their report against the next sederunt[3]."

In the sixth session, on Tuesday, the 27th of November, the committee presented their report of the five books which Johnston had forged and exhibited as the true registers, and

[1] Stevenson's Church and State, lib. ii. p. 280-284.—Balfour's Annals, 301.—Baillie's Letters, i. 128-131.

[2] Baillie's Letters, i. p. 132.—Balfour's Annals, ii. 301.

[3] Stevenson's Church and State, p. 287.—Baillie's Letters, i. p. 136.—Balfour's Annals, ii. p. 301-2.

at the same time gave their reasons for believing them to be genuine. The commissioner expressed dissatisfaction with Johnston's reasons, and objected to their being received as true records; in consequence the moderator deferred putting it to the vote whether or not they were the genuine registers of the church till the following day. But it is evident that if "these famous, authentic, and good registers" had been genuine, no reasoning or voting would have been necessary to prove their authenticity; and the fact that so much solemnity and extraordinary care was taken to prove what ought to have been a self-evident fact, shews their surreptitious origin. At last the commissioner procured an audience for the protest or declinature of the bishops, which, after every possible delay had been interposed, was read by Dr. Robert Hamilton their procurator.

WE, ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS, and other undersubscribers, for ourselves and in name and behalf of the CHURCH OF SCOTLAND: WHEREAS it hath pleased the king's majesty to indict a General Assembly of the church to be kept at Glasgow, Nov. 21, 1638, for composing and settling of the distractions of the same, first do acknowledge and profess, that a General Assembly, lawfully called and orderly convened, is a most necessary and effectual mean for removing those evils wherewith the said church is infested, and for settling the order which becometh the house of God; and that we wish nothing more than a meeting of a peaceable and orderly Assembly to that effect. Secondly, we acknowledge and profess, as becometh good Christians and faithful subjects, that his majesty hath authority, by his prerogative royal, to call Assemblies, as is acknowledged by the Assembly at Glasgow, 1610, and parliament, 1612, and that it is not lawful to convene without his royal consent and approbation, except we will put ourselves in danger of being called in question for sedition.

Yet, nevertheless, in sundry respects, we cannot but esteem this meeting at Glasgow most unlawful and disorderly, and their proceedings VOID AND NULL IN LAW, for the causes and reasons following:—

I. Before his majesty's royal warrant to my lord commissioner, his grace, to indict a lawful free General Assembly, the usurped authority of the Tables (as they call them) by their missives and instructions, did give order and direction for all presbyteries to elect and choose their commissioners for the Assembly, and for seeking of God's blessing to it, to keep a solemn fast, September 16; whereas his majesty's warrant for indicting was not published till the 22d of that month: so that they, preventing, and not proceeding by warrant of royal autho-

rity, the pretended commissioners being chosen *before* the presbyteries were authorized to make election, cannot be reputed members of a lawful Assembly.

II. A lawful Assembly must not only be indicted by lawful authority (as we acknowledge this to be), but also constituted of such members as are requisite to make up such a body. For if, according to the indiction, none at all do convene, or where the clergy is called there meet none but laics, or more laics than of the clergy with equal power to judge and determine; or such of the laics and clergy as are not lawfully authorized, or are not capable of that employment by their places; or such as are legally disabled to sit and decide in an Assembly of the church; a meeting consisting of such members cannot be thought a free and lawful Assembly. By that Act of Parliament, Jas. VI. par. 3, cap. 46, 1572, 'every minister who shall pretend to be a minister of God's Word and Sacraments is bound to give his assent and subscription to the articles of religion contained in the acts of our sovereign lord's parliament, and in presence of the archbishop, superintendent, or commissioner of the province, give his oath for acknowledging and recognoscing of our sovereign lord and his authority, and bring a testimonial in writing thereupon, and openly, upon some Sunday in time of sermon or public prayers, in the kirk where he ought to attend, read both the testimonial and confession, and of new make the said oath within a month after his admission, under the pain that every person that shall not do as is above appointed shall, *ipso facto*, be deprived, and all his ecclesiastical promotions and living shall be then vacant, as if he were then naturally dead, and that all inferior persons under prelates be called before the archbishops, bishops, superintendents, and commissioners of the dioceses or province within which they dwell as the act bears.'

III. All of the clergy convened to this Assembly pretend themselves to be ministers of God's Word and Sacraments, and have benefices or other ecclesiastical livings: yet, nevertheless, the most part of them have never, in presence of the archbishop, bishop, superintendent, or commissioner of the diocese or province, subscribed the articles of religion contained in the acts of parliament, and given their oath for acknowledging and recognoscing our sovereign lord and his authority, and brought a testimonial thereof: and therefore they are, *ipso facto*, deprived, and their places void, as if they were naturally dead; and consequently, having no place nor function in the church, cannot be commissioners to this Assembly: *hoc maximè attento*, that the said persons not only have never given their

oath for acknowledging his majesty's authority, nor can shew any testimonial thereupon, as they are bound by the said act; but also having, as subjects comprehended in the representative body of this kingdom, promised to acknowledge, obey, maintain, defend, and advance the life, honour, safety, dignity, sovereign authority, and prerogative royal of his sovereign majesty, his heirs, and successors, and privileges of his highness' crown, with their lives, lands, and goods, to the uttermost of their power constantly and faithfully to withstand all and whatsoever persons, powers, and estates, who shall presume, prease, or intend any wise to impugn, prejudge, hurt, or impair the same, and never to come in the contrary thereof, directly or indirectly in any time coming, as the act of parliament Jas. VI. parl. 18, cap. 1, does proport.

And moreover, being obliged at their admission to give their oath for performance of this duty of their allegiance, 'and to testify and declare on their conscience that the king is the lawful supreme governor, as well in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical as temporal, and to assist and defend all jurisdiction and authority belonging to his majesty by the act of parliament 1612;' yet, notwithstanding of the said bands, acts, and promises, whereby the said persons are so strictly bound to the performance of the premises; his majesty having ordained by act of council at Holyrood House, September 24, 1638, and proclamations following thereupon, that all his majesty's lieges, of whatsoever estate, degree, or quality, ecclesiastical or temporal, should swear and subscribe the said confession, together with a general band for defending his majesty's person and authority against all enemies within this realm or without; have not only refused to subscribe the said band and confession, but have in their sermons and other speeches dissuaded, deterred, impeded, and hindered others of the lieges to subscribe the same, and publicly protested against the subscription thereof; and thereupon cannot convene nor concur lawfully to the making up of the body of an Assembly of the kirk, as being deprived and denuded of all place and function in the same.

IV. A General Assembly was condescended to, out of his majesty's gracious clemency and pious disposition, as a royal favour to those that so should acknowledge the same, and acquiesce to his gracious pleasure, and carry themselves peaceably as loyal and dutiful subjects; which the commissioners directed to this Assembly, supposed to be of the number of those that adhere to the last protestation made at Edinburgh, September 1638, do not so account of, and accept, as appears

by the said protestation, whereby they protest that it shall be lawful for them, as at other times, so at this, to assemble themselves notwithstanding any impediment or prerogative to the contrary; as also by continuing their meetings and Tables discharged by authority, refusing to subscribe the band according to his majesty's and council's command for maintaining his majesty's royal person and authority, protesting against the same, still insisting with the lieges to subscribe the band of mutual defence against all persons whatsoever, and remitting none of their former proceedings, whereby his majesty's wrath was provoked: thereby they are become in the same state and condition wherein they were before his majesty's proclamation and pardon, and so forfeit the favour of this Assembly and liberty to be members thereof. And others of his majesty's subjects may justly fear to meet with them in this convention: for that by the act of Jas. VI. parl. 15, cap. 31, prelacies being declared to be *one* of the *three estates* of this kingdom; and by the act of Jas. VI. parl. 8, cap. 133, 'all persons are discharged to impugn the dignity and authority of the three estates, or any of them in time coming, *under the pain of treason*.' And whereas the king by his proclamation declares archbishops and bishops to have voice in the General Assembly, and calls them to the same for that effect, as constantly they have been in use in all Assemblies where they have been present, as appears by many acts of General Assembly ordaining them to keep and assist at the same, as in the Assembly at Edinburgh, Dec. 15, 1566; at Edinburgh, March 6, 1572; at Edinburgh, May 10, 1586; and by a letter written by the Assembly, March 6, 1573, to the regent, earnestly desiring his own or his commissioner's presence and the lords of council and the bishops at the Assembly: they, notwithstanding, by the said protestation, September 22, declared archbishops and bishops to have no warrant for their office in this kirk, to be authorised with no lawful commission, and to have no place nor voice in this Assembly; and withal, do arrogate to their meetings a *sovereign authority* to determine of all questions and doubts that can arise, contrary to the freedom of the Assembly, whether in constitution and members, or in the matters to be treated, or in manner and order of proceeding; which how it doth stand with his majesty's supremacy in all causes and over all persons we leave it to that judgment whereunto it belongeth, and do call God and man to witness if these be fit members of an Assembly intended for the order and peace of the church.

Giving and not granting that the persons foresaid directed commissioners in name of the clergy to this meeting

were capable of that authority, and that the said presbyteries had the authority to direct commissioners to the General Assembly, yet have they now *lost and fallen* from all such right, if any they had, in so far as they have deposed the moderators, who were lawfully appointed to govern them, by the bishops in their synods, and elected others in their place, contrary to the act of the Assembly at Glasgow, 1610, and act of parliament 1612, ordaining bishops to be moderators at these meetings; and, in their absence, the minister whom the bishop should appoint at the synod. So these meetings, having disclaimed the authority of bishops, deposed their lawful moderators, and choosing others without authority, cannot be esteemed lawful convocations, that can have lawful power of sending out commissioners with authority to judge of the affairs of this church.

V. And yet doth the nullity of the commissions, flowing from such meetings, further appear in this, that they have associate to themselves a laick ruler (as they call him) out of every session and parish; who being ordinarily the lord of the parish, or a man of the greatest authority in the bounds, doth overrule in the election of the said commissioners, both by his authority, and their number being more than the ministers, whereof some being ordinarily absent, and five or six, or so many of them put in list, and removed, there remain but a few ministers to vote to the elections: and, in effect, the commissioners for the clergy are chosen by laymen, contrary to all order, decency, and custom observed in the Christian world, nowise according to the custom of this church which they pretend to follow: the presbyteries formerly never associating to themselves lay-elders in the election of the commissioners to the General Assembly, but only for their assistance in discipline and correction of manners; calling for them at such occasions as they stood in need of their *godly concurrence*, declaring otherwise their meeting not necessary, and providing expressly that they should not be equal, but fewer in number than the pastors, as by act of Assembly at St. Andrews, April 24th, 1582, (when Master Andrew Melville was moderator) doth appear. Like as these forty years bygone and upwards, long before the re-establishing of bishops, these lay-elders have not been called at all to presbyteries. And by an act at Dundee, 1597, (whereby it is pretended that presbyteries have authority to send these lay commissioners,) it doth nowhere appear that those lay-elders had any hand in choosing of the ministers; and this is the only act of the Assembly authorising presbyters to choose commissioners to the General Assembly:

nor had lay-elders sat ordinarily in presbyteries upon any occasion these forty years and upwards, nor ever had any place nor voice in election of ministers for the General Assembly, and, consequently, those chosen by them to this Assembly, have no lawful power nor authority.

VI. Beside, the persons ecclesiastical, pretended to be authorised commissioners to this Assembly, have so behaved themselves, that justly they may be thought unworthy and incapable of commission to a free and lawful Assembly.

1. For that, by their seditious and railing sermons and pamphlets, they have wounded the king's honour and sovereign authority, and animated his lieges to rebellion, averring that all authority sovereign is *originally* in the *collective body*, derived from them to the prince; and not only in case of negligence it is *suppletivè* in the *collective body*, as being communicate from the commonty to the king, *cumulativè* not *privativè*, but also, in case of maladministration, to return to the *collective body*; so that *rex excidit jure suo*, and that they may refuse obedience.

2. Next, they are known to be such as have either been schismatically refractory, and opposite to good order settled in the church and state, or such as having promised, subscribed, and sworn obedience to their ordinary, have never made conscience of their oath; or such as have sworn, and accordingly practised, yet, contrary to their promise and practice, have resiled, to the contempt of authority and disturbance of the church; or such as are under the censures of the church of Ireland, for their disobedience to order; or under the censures of this church, or convened (or at least deserving to be convened) before the ordinaries, or a lawful General Assembly, for divers transgressions deserving deprivation:—as, first, for uttering in their sermons rash and irreverent speeches, in pulpit, against his majesty's council and their proceedings, punishable by deprivation by the act of Assembly at Edinburgh, May 22, 1590. Next, for reproving his majesty's laws, statutes, and ordinances, contrary to the act of Assembly at Perth, May 1, 1596. Thirdly, for expressing of men's names in pulpit, or describing them vively to their reproach, when there was no notorious fault, against another act of the same Assembly. Fourthly, for using applications in their sermons, not tending to the edification of their present auditory, contrary to another act of the same Assembly. Fifthly, for keeping conventions, not allowed by his majesty, without his knowledge and consent, contrary to another act of the same Assembly. Sixthly, for receiving of people of other ministers' flocks to the communion, contrary

to order, acts of Assembly, and councils. Seventhly, for intruding themselves into other men's pulpits without calling or authority. Eighthly, for usurping the authority to convene their brethren, and proceed against them to the censures of suspension and deprivation. Ninthly, for pressing the people to subscribe a Covenant not allowed by authority, and opposing and withstanding the subscribing of a Covenant offered by his majesty, and allowed by the council; besides many personal faults and enormities, whereof many of them are guilty, which, in charity, we forbear to express. But hereby it doth appear, how unfit these persons are to be members of a free and lawful Assembly.

VII. Nor doth it stand with reason, scripture, or practice of the christian church, that laymen should be authorised to have decisive voice in a General Assembly. In that act of Dundee, 1597, whereby these elders pretend to have this place, there is no warrant expressed for them to deliberate and determine. Their presence and assistance we approve, being allowed and authorised by the prince. The king's majesty's presence in person, or by his delegates, we hold most necessary, to see all things orderly and peaceably done, and that he have the chief hand in all deliberations and determinations. Nor do we refuse that any intelligent or moderate man may make remonstrance of his opinion, with the reasons of it, in that way that becometh him in a national Assembly, due reverence being kept, and confusion avoided. But that any layman, except he be delegated by sovereign authority, shall presume to have a definitive or decisive voice, we esteem it to be intrusion upon the pastoral charge, and without warrant. May we not, therefore, intreat my lord commissioner his grace, in the words of the fathers of the fourth general council at Chalcedon, *mitte foras superfluos?* Nor will a pious prince be offended with it; but, with Theodosius the younger, will say, *Illegitimum est, cum qui non sit in ordine sanctissimorum episcoporum ecclesiasticis immiscere tractatibus:* and Pulcheria, the empress, commanded Strategus, *Ut clerici, monachi et laici vi repellerentur, exceptis paucis illis quos episcopi secum duxerunt.* Upon this respect was Martinus, in that council of Chalcedon, moved to say, *Non esse suum, sed episcoporum tantum, subscribere.*

VIII. If these pretended commissioners, both lay and ecclesiastical, were lawfully authorised (as it is evident they are not), and for none other cause declinable, yet the law doth admit that justly a judge may be declined who is probably suspect. And of all probabilities, this is the most pregnant,

when the judge, before he come to judgment, doth give sentence of these things he hath to judge. This made our reformers' protestation against the council of Trent valid, and their not compearing justifiable, because Pope Leo X. had precondemned Luther, as appeared by his bull dated 8th of June, 1520, renewed by Paul III., dated in August 1535. This was the cause why Athanasius would not give his appearance at some councils, nor Hosius of Corduba, nor Maximus, patriarch of Constantinople. But so it is; the most part, if not all of the said commissioners directed to this meeting, have precondemned episcopal government, and condemned, at least suspended, obedience to the acts of the General Assembly and parliament, concerning the five articles of Perth; have approved their covenant as most necessary to be embraced of all in this kingdom, and not only have given judgment of these things beforehand, but by most solemn oaths have bound themselves to defend and stand to the same: as doth appear by their covenant, petitions, protestations, pamphlets, libels, and sermons; and therefore by no law nor equity can these pretended commissioners be admitted to determine in this meeting concerning those persons and points which beforehand they have so unjustly condemned.

IX. Further, with no law nor reason can it subsist that the same persons shall be both judges and parties. And we appeal to the consciences of all honest men, if all, at least the greatest part, of the pretended commissioners, have not declared themselves party to the archbishops and bishops of this church: for in that they have declined the bishops to be their judges, as being their party (as their declinatures, petitions, declarations, and protestations do bear), have they not *simul et semel et ipso facto* declared themselves to be party against bishops; whom they have not only declined, but persecuted by their calumnies and reproaches, vented by word and writ in public and in private, by invading [assaulting] their persons, opposing and oppressing them by strength of an unlawful combination; for the subscribing and swearing whereof they have, by their own authority, indicted and kept fasts, not only in their own church, but, where worthy men refused to be accessory to these disorderly and impious courses, they have (by aid of the unruly multitude) entered their churches, usurped upon their charges, reading and causing to be read that unlawful covenant; by threatening and menacing, compelling some (otherwise unwilling), out of just fear, to set their hands to it; by processing, suspending, and removing of ediot and worthy ministers from their places, by the usurped authority of their

Tables and presbyteries? And whereas, by all law and justice, persons finding themselves wronged in judgment have never been denied the remedy of declinatory and appellation; nevertheless not a few of these presbyteries have proceeded against sundry worthy ministers, who have declined and appealed from their judgments without respect to this defence; by these means craftily intending to disable them to be commissioners for the church; directly or indirectly causing their stipends to be kept back from them: by which means, not the least part of the subscribing ministers have been gained to their covenant.

But it is without example uncharitable and illegal, that under the pretext of summons (the like whereof was never used, nor in the like manner, against the most heinous malefactors in the kingdom), they have devised, forged, vented, and published a most infamous and scurril libel, full of infamous lies and malicious calumnies against the archbishops and bishops of this church; and have first given out from their Tables the order prescribed in these subsequent articles, which we have inserted, that the world may be witness of the illegality and maliciousness of their proceedings.

1. To desire the presbytery of every bishop, especially where he keeps his residence, as also the presbytery where his cathedral seat is, to have a special care of this bill and complaint against the prelates, and particularly against the bishop of their diocese. 2. That some noblemen (if any be within the presbytery), some gentlemen and barons, some ministers and some commons, who are not chosen commissioners to the Assembly, in their own name, and in name of all other covenanters or complainers, either within the presbytery or diocese, or whole kingdom, who are not commissioners to the Assembly, will adhere and assist in this complaint, that they present this bill to the presbytery. 3. That they who are complainers have a particular care to fill up the blanks left in the bill, in the subsumptions of the particular faults committed by the bishop of the diocese against these general rules, canons, and acts; or if these blanks will not contain the same, that the complainers draw up, in a particular claim, all the particular faults and transgressions of the bishop of that diocese against these rules, canons, and acts, or any other law of the church or kingdom, and present the same to the presbytery, with this general complaint. . . . . 6. That the presbytery ordain all their pastors out of pulpit, on a sabbath day before noon, to cause to be read publicly this whole

complaint and the presbyteries' reference to the Assembly, and so admonish the bishop of that diocese the delinquent complained upon, with the rest of his colleagues, to be present at the General Assembly to answer to the particular complaint, both in the particular and general heads thereof, given or to be given in. And likewise out of pulpit to admonish all others who have interest either in the pursuing or referring this complaint, to be present at the said Assembly. 7. That the presbytery insert in their presbytery books the whole tenor of this complaint, both in the general and particular heads thereof; and that they have a care to cause delivery, by their ordinary beadle, to the bishop of the diocese, a copy thereof, and a copy of an act referring the same to the Assembly, and summon him to compeir before the Assembly. . . . 8. That the complainers within the presbytery where the bishop is resident or hath his cathedral, be careful to keep correspondence with those in other presbyteries within their diocese who best can specify and verify their bishop's usurpation and transgressions.'

According to which articles, upon Sunday, October 28th, they caused read the said libel in all the churches in Edinburgh, notwithstanding my lord commissioner's command, given to the provost and bailies, to the contrary, except in Holyrood House, where it was read the next Sunday, as it was in the other churches of the kingdom; proceeding herein against all charity, which doth not behave itself unseemly, nor delighteth in the discovery of men's nakedness, nor take up a reproach, nor backbite with the tongue; much less to write a book against a brother. 2. Against the order prescribed by the apostles, 'not to rebuke an elder, but to entreat him as a father:' and by the act of parliament, James VI. par. 8, discharging all persons to impugn or to procure the diminution of the authority and power of the three estates, or any of them. 3. Against all lawful and formal proceeding, especially that prescribed by the act of General Assembly at Perth, March 1st, 1596; whereby it is ordained, that all summonses contain the special cause and crime, which the said libel does not; naming only general calumnies, reproaches, and aspersions, without instruction of any particular, but leaving these to be filled up by malicious delation, after they have defamed their brethren by publishing this libel; as appears by the 8th and 11th articles of the said instructions, and against the order prescribed by the Assembly at St. Andrews, April 24th, 1582, whereby it is enacted, 'that in process of

deprivation of ministers, there be a libelled precept upon forty days' warning, being *within* the realm, and threescore days, being *without* the realm, to be directed by the kirk and such commissioners thereof as elect and direct the person complained of, summoning them to compear and answer upon the complaint. And in case of their absence at the first summons, the second to be directed upon the like warning, with certification, if he fail, the libel shall be admitted to probation, and he shall be holden *pro confesso*.' Which form not being kept in a summons inferring the punishment of deprivation, the same cannot be sustained by the order of that Assembly. 4. Against common equity, which admits summons directed by the authority of these pretended presbyteries cannot sustain for compearance before the General Assembly, nor could reference be made from the presbyteries to the General Assembly, the parties never being summoned to compear before the presbytery, whereby, either in presence of the party or in case of contumacy, the complaint might be referred to the Assembly. That there was no citation before the reference is clear by the said instructions. And what a strange and odious form it is, to insert such a calumnious libel in the presbytery books, without citing the parties to answer thereto; and to cite bishops before the General Assembly by the said libel, by publishing the same at churches to which they had no relation, and were many miles distant, we leave it to the judgment of indifferent men. 5. Against all decency and respect due to men of their place, the said persons being men of dignity, and some of them of his majesty's most honourable privy council, and known to be of blameless conversation, and to have deserved well, thus to be reviled and traduced, doth redound to the reproach of church and state, and of the gospel whereof they are preachers. 6. Lastly, to omit many other informalities against their own consciences, which we charge in the sight of God, as they must answer before His great and fearful tribunal, if they suspect and know not perfectly, according to the judgment of charity, them whom they thus accuse, to be free of these crimes wherewith they charge them, at least many of them, as appears evidently by the eleventh article of the said instructions, having therein libelled the general and have yet to seek the specification thereof, from the malice of their neighbours, if they can furnish it. By which informal and malicious proceeding it is most apparent that our said parties do seek our disgrace and overthrow most maliciously and illegally. And therefore we call heaven and earth to witness if this be not a barbarous and violent perse-

cution, that, all circumstances being considered, hath few or none to parallel it since the beginning of christianity; and if we have not just cause to decline the said pretended commissioners as our party.

Moreover, can these men expect but in a lawful assembly they were to be called and censured for their enormous transgressions foresaid? And will any man think, that they can be judges in their own cause? It is alleged out of the canon law against the pope, that if the pope be at variance with any man, he ought not to be judge himself, but to choose arbitrators. And this may militate against them, except they be more unruly than popes. Ludovicus Bavarus, and all the estates of Germany with him, did plead this nullity against the sentence and proceedings of John XXII. and of his council: and the archbishop of Cologne, 1546, did plead the nullity of Paul III. his bull of excommunication, because he protested that so soon as a lawful council should be opened, he would implead the pope as party, being guilty of many things censurable by the council.

X. But the late protestation doth shew the authors thereof to be no less injurious to our peace and authority than they are overweening of their own. For it is against reason and practice of the christian church that no primate, archbishop, or bishop, have place or voice, deliberative or decisive, in General Assemblies, except they be authorised and elected by their presbyterial meetings, consisting of preaching and ruling elders (as they call them), and without warrant or example in the primitive and purest times of the church.

This also doth infer the nullity of an Assembly, if the moderator and president for matters of doctrine and discipline shall be neither the primate, archbishop, nor bishop, but he who, by plurality of presbyters and laymen's voices, shall be elected: which haply may be one of the inferior clergy, or a lay person, as sometimes it hath fallen out. Whereas, canonically, according to the ancient practice of the church, the primate should preside according to the constitution of the first council of Nice, can. 6, of Antioch, can. 9, and of the imperial law, Novel Constitut. 123, cap. 10, and according to our own law. For what place in Assemblies archbishops and bishops had in other christian nations, the same they had (no doubt) in Scotland, and yet still do retain, except by some municipal law it hath been restrained, which cannot be shown. For the restraint of their authority by the act of parliament 1592, is restored by the act of parliament 1606 and 1609, and all acts prejudicial to their jurisdiction abrogated. Neither

doth that act, 1592, establishing General Assemblies, debar bishops from presiding therein; nor the abrogation of their commission granted to them by act of parliament in ecclesiastical causes, imply and infer the abrogation of that authority, which they received not from the parliament, but from Christ, from whom they received spiritual oversight of the clergy under their charge; whereunto belongeth the presidentship in all Assemblies for matters spiritual, always with due submission to the supreme governor; which is so intrinsically inherent in them as they are bishops, that *hoc ipso* that they are bishops, they are presidents of all Assemblies of the clergy: as the chancellor of the kingdom hath place in council and session not by any act or statute, but *hoc ipso* that he is chancellor. By act of parliament bishops are declared to have their right in synods and other inferior meetings, but by no law restrained nor debarred from the exercise of it in national assemblies. And the law allowing bishops to be moderators of the synods doth present a list in absence of the metropolitan, to whom, of right, this place doth belong as said is, out of which the moderator of the General Assembly shall be chosen. For is it not more agreeable to reason, order, and decency, that out of moderators of synods a moderator of the General Assembly should be chosen, than of the inferior clergy subject to them?

XI. As concerning that act of the General Assembly, 1580, whereby bishops are declared to have no warrant out of Scripture, if corruption of time shall be regarded, the authority of that Assembly might be neglected no less than that at Glasgow, 1610. But it is ordinary that prior acts of assemblies and parliaments give place to the posterior: for *posteriora derogant prioribus*. And there passed not full six years when a General Assembly at Edinburgh found, that the name of bishops hath a special charge and function annexed to it by the word of God; and that it was lawful for the General Assembly to admit a bishop to a benefice presented by the king's majesty, with power to admit, visit, and deprive ministers, and to be moderators of the presbyteries where they are resident, and subject only to the sentence of the General Assembly.

As for that act at Montrose, let them answer to it that have their calling by that commission. We profess that we have a lawful calling by the election of the clergy, who are of the chapter of our cathedrals, and consecration of bishops by his majesty's consent and approbation, according to the laudable laws and ancient custom of this kingdom, and of the church in ancient times, and do homage to our sovereign lord for our temporalities, and acknowledge him *solo Deo minorem* next

unto God in all causes and over all persons, spiritual or temporal, in his own dominions supreme governor.

* * * * * * * *

XII. Lastly, it is most manifest by the premises how absurd it is, and contrary to all reason and practice of the christian church, that archbishops and bishops shall be judged by presbyters; and more absurd that they should be judged by a mixed meeting of presbyters and laicks, convening without lawful authority of the church. How and by whom they are to be judged according to the custom of ancient times, may be seen by the council of Chalcedon, can. 9, and Concil. Milevit. can. 22, and Concil. Carthag. 2, can. 10. Nor do we decline the lawful trial of any competent judicatory in the kingdom, especially of a General Assembly lawfully constitute, or of his majesty's high commissioner, for any thing in life and doctrine can be laid to our charge: only we declare and affirm, that it is against order, decency, and Scripture, that we should be judged by presbyters, or by laics, without authority or commission of sovereign authority.

For the reasons foresaid, and many more, and for discharge of our duty to God, to his church, and to our sacred sovereign, lest, by our silence, we betray the church's right, his majesty's authority, and our own consciences, we, for ourselves, and in name of the Church of Scotland, are forced to PROTEST,—THAT THIS ASSEMBLY be reputed and holden NULL IN LAW DIVINE AND HUMAN; and that no churchman be holden to appear before, assist, or approve it, and, THEREFORE, that no letter, petition, subscription, interlocutor, certification, admonition, or other act whatsoever proceeding from the said Assembly, or any member thereof, be any ways prejudicial to the religion and confession of faith by act of parliament established, or to the church, or to any member thereof, or to the jurisdiction, liberties, privileges, rents, benefices, and possessions of the same, acts of General Assembly, of council and parliament in favour thereof, or to the three estates of the kingdom, or any of them, or to us, or any of us, in our persons or estates, authority, jurisdiction, dignity, rents, benefices, reputation, and good name; but on the contrary, that all such acts and deeds above mentioned, and every one of them, are, and shall be reputed and esteemed, UNJUST, ILLEGAL, AND NULL IN THEMSELVES, with all that hath followed or may follow thereupon.

And forasmuch as the said Assembly doth intend (as we are informed) to call in question, discuss, and condemn, things not only in themselves lawful and warrantable, but also defined and determined by acts of General Assembly and parliaments,

and in practice accordingly, to the disgrace and prejudice of the reformed religion, authorities of the laws, and liberties of the church and kingdom, weakening his majesty's authority, disgracing the profession and practice which he holdeth in the communion of the church where he liveth, and branding of reformed churches with the foul aspersions of idolatry and superstition—*WE PROTEST BEFORE GOD AND MAN, that what shall be done in this kind may not redound to the disgrace or disadvantage of reformed religion, NOR BE REPUTED A DEED OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.*

WE PROTEST that we embrace and hold, that the religion presently professed in the church of Scotland, according to the profession thereof received by the estates of this kingdom, and ratified in parliament in the year 1567, is the true religion, bringing men to eternal salvation, and do detest all contrary error.

WE PROTEST that episcopal government in the church is lawful and necessary: and that the same is not opposed and impugned for any defect or fault, either in the government or governors; but by the malice and craft of the devil, envying the success of that government in this church these many years by past, most evident in planting of churches with able and learned ministers, recovering of the church rents, helping of the ministers' stipends, preventing of these jars betwixt the king and the church, which in former times dangerously infested the same, keeping the people in peace and obedience, and suppressing popery, which, in respect either of the number of their professors or the boldness of their profession, was never at so low an ebb in this kingdom as before these stirs.

WE PROTEST that, seeing these who for scruple of conscience did mislike the service-book, canons, and high commission, which were apprehended or given forth to be the cause of the troubles of this church, have now received satisfaction, and his majesty is graciously pleased to forget and forgive all offences by-past in these stirs, that all the subjects of this kingdom may live in peace and christian love, as becometh faithful subjects and good christians, laying aside all hatred, envy, and bitterness; and if any shall refuse so to do, they may bear the blame, and be thought the cause of the troubles that may ensue; and the same be not imputed to us, or any of us, who desire nothing more than to live in peace and concord with all men, under his majesty's obedience; and who have committed nothing against the laws of the kingdom and church that may give any man just cause of offence; and are

so far from wishing hurt to any man, in his person or estate, notwithstanding all the indignities and injuries we have suffered, that for quenching this present combustion, and settling peace in this church and country, we could be content (after clearing of our innocency of all things wherewith we be charged) not only to lay down our bishopries at his majesty's feet, to be disposed of at his royal pleasure, but also, if so be it pleased God, to lay down our lives, and become a sacrifice for this atonement.

WE PROTEST, *in the sight of* GOD, to whom one day we must give account, that we make use of this DECLINATOR and PROTESTATION out of the conscience of our duty to God and his church, and not out of fear of any guiltiness, whereof any of us is conscious to himself, either of wickedness in our lives, or miscarriage in our callings; being content, every one of us, for our own particular (as we have never shown ourselves to be otherwise), to undergo the lawful and most exact trial of any competent judicatory within this kingdom, or of his majesty's high commissioner.

And we most humbly entreat his grace to intercede with the king's majesty, that he may appoint a free and lawful General Assembly, such as God's word, the practice of the primitive church, and laws of the kingdom, do prescribe and allow, with all convenient speed, to the effect the present distractions of the church may be settled. And if there be any thing to be laid to the charge of any of the clergy, of whatsoever degree, either in life or manners, or doctrine, or exercise of his calling and jurisdiction, he may be heard to answer all accusations, and abide all trial, either for clearing his innocency or suffering condign punishment, according to his transgressions: DECLINING always this Assembly for the causes above written. Like as by these presents we and every one of us DECLINE THE SAME, the whole members thereof, and commissioners foresaid directed thereto and every one of them.

WE PROTEST that this our protestation, in respect of our lawful absence, may be received in the name of us undersubscribing for ourselves, and in the name of the Church of Scotland that shall adhere to the said protestation, and in the name of every one of them, from our well-beloved Dr. Robert Hamilton, minister of Glasford, to whom by these presents we give our full power and express mandate to present the same in or at the said Assembly, or where else it shall be necessary to be used, with all submission and obedience due to our gracious sovereign and his majesty's high commissioner: and upon the presenting and using thereof, acts and instruments to

crave, and all other things to do that necessarily are required in such cases: firm and stable holding, or for to hold, what he or any of them shall lawfully do in the premises.

In witness whereof, as we are ready with our blood, so with our hand we have subscribed these presents at the palace of Holyrood House, Newcastle and Glasgow, the 16th, 17th, and 20th days of November, 1638, *et sic subscribitur*[1].

Jo. St. Andreæ, arch.
Pa. Glasgow,
Da. Edinburgen,
Tho. Gallovidien,
Jo. Rossen,
Walterius Brechinen.

The Assembly treated this noble protest with scorn and contempt. They asserted their perfect independence on the royal authority, and their competency to meet, sit, and vote, without the presence of the bishops; and also their power as judges over the governors of the church, who by law and usage were constitutional members of the Assembly, and had been so ever since the first Protestant Assembly after the Reformation. Many protests were presented and read from several places from the inferior clergy, both against the lay elders and the manner of the election of the ministers, as both unlawful and unusual, and because the lay elders equalled, and in some cases outnumbered, the ministers. "For these and other weighty causes, the election of such commissioners, and their place in this Assembly being so dangerous to the church, threaten the same with the most intolerable yoke of bondage, to be laid on the neck of the presbyteries by laic overruling elders, to the prejudice of the liberties of the said presbyteries, and whole discipline of this church." The strongest protest of all was presented by the presbytery of Glasgow, but principal Bailie objected to its being read. The commissioner pressed the reading of it, "but all in vain; for no justice could be had from them, especially on a point which so much concerned their reputation; for they conceived it would be a great blur to their business, if a protestation (made by that presbytery in which was the seat of the Assembly) should be known; and, therefore, they would neither read it, nor did they deliver it back again, against all rules both of justice and equity[2]."

The lord Montgomery and Mr. Durie, one of the principal

[1] Large Declaration, p. 248-264. [2] Ibid. pp. 265-268.

clerks of session, "took instruments that the bishops thereby acknowledged their citation, that they had compeared by their procurator, and therefore that their personal absence was wilful; and craved that Dr. Hamilton, as their procurator, might be cited *apud acta*. This was no sooner sought than granted." The commissioner protested against this proceeding, and produced several other protests from the dean and chapter of Edinburgh, and several other clergy, against the lay-elders, and against the powers assumed by the Assembly; and in the meantime, as lay elders were so much harped on, the moderator caused to be read some papers in support of their sitting in Assemblies, said to have been drawn up by Mr. David Calderwood the historian, who, though he was no member of the Assembly, having no parochial charge, lodged in a room adjoining the moderator's, and promoted by his studies the proceedings of the Assembly[1].

Session seven, Wednesday, 28th November. — The first business which came before the Assembly was the approbation of the five spurious registers. The commissioner protested against the reception of these five books as sufficient registers, and that neither his royal master, nor the lords of the clergy, should suffer any prejudice by any thing in them. Notwithstanding the committee which had revised them gave in a written declaration "that these registers are famous, authentic, and good registers, which ought to be so reputed, and have public faith in judgment, and outwith the same as valid and true records in all things; and with that report they gave in a paper, containing nineteen reasons, proving the said registers to be authentic." Therefore "the whole Assembly did unanimously approve of these books as the true and authentic registers of our church, and appointed the testimony of the committee, and their reasons, to be inserted in the books of Assembly[2]."

Two written replies to the bishops' declinature were read in this session, which Baillie confesses "*were raw and rude*," both of which professed to be answers to all the material parts of the bishop's "invective[3]." The Assembly, says Burnet, "went on at such a rate, that the marquis judged it no longer fit to bear with their courses; for all elections, how disorderly soever, were judged good; their ears were shut upon reason, and the bishops' declinature being read, was rejected, and an

[1] Baillie's Letters, i. 136. — Balfour's Annals, ii. 307. — Stevenson's Church and State, 287-290.

[2] Stevenson's Church and State, 287-290. [3] Baillie's Letters, i. 139.

answer drawn: wherefore, on the 28th, in the morning, he called a council in the Chapter-house, and told them he was necessitated to dissolve the Assembly, and gave his reasons for doing it, using much industry to gain them to concur with him in it. The earl of Argyle asked if he was to desire the council's approbation of what he intended, or not: the marquis answered, his instructions from his majesty were clear and positive for what he was to do, and therefore it was not in his power to let any debate be whether he should do it or not; only he desired their concurrence and advice as to the manner of doing it. Two hours were spent in discourse, but clear advices were not given from any of them. From thence the marquis went to the church where the Assembly sat; and after he sat a long witness to some debates that were among them, it was offered to be put to the vote whether the Assembly was a free Assembly, notwithstanding the bishop's declinature, or not[1]."

The Assembly had been occupied with a debate on the bishops' declinature, and the answer to it, which gradually branched off into a dissertation on the Synod of Dort, arminianism, and popery; but both sides became wearied of a dispute that seemed to be interminable, and as it was alleged that the bishops were "summoned for heresy,—viz. points of popery and arminianism,"—to put an end to the debate, the moderator "stated the question, whether or not this Assembly found themselves *judges* to the bishops, notwithstanding of their declinature? but when they were about to vote, the lord commissioner interrupted them." The "Large Declaration" states, that "they gave our commissioner the occasion to do and declare that which, by our special commandment, he had resolved; for he presently made a speech of a competent length, the sum whereof was this:—'I should, perhaps, have continued a little longer with you, if you had not fallen upon a point which doth enforce my deserting you. You are now about to settle the lawfulness of this judicatory, and the competency of it against the bishops whom you have cited here, neither of which I can allow, if I shall discharge either my duty towards God, or loyalty towards my gracious and just master. This is a day to me both of gladness and sadness; gladness, in that I have seen this Assembly meet, and that I shall now, in his majesty's name, make good unto you all his most gracious offers in his royal proclamation; of sadness, in that you, who have called so much for a free General Assembly, and having one *most free*, in his

[1] Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton, p. 101.

majesty's intentions, granted, you have so handled and marred the matter, that *there is not the least shadow of freedom to be discerned in this your meeting* by any man who hath not given a bill of divorce both to his understanding and conscience. With what wresting and wringing your last protestation charges his majesty's last gracious proclamation in the point of prelimitations, is both known and misliked by many even of your own pretended Covenant; but whether your courses, especially in the elections of the members of this Assembly, be not only prelimitations of it, but strong bars against the freedom of it, nay, utterly destructive both of the name and nature of a free Assembly, and unavoidably inducing upon it many and main nullities, will be made manifest to the whole world.

"'But his majesty's sincere intentions being to perform, in a lawful Assembly, all he hath promised in his gracious proclamation, if you find out a way how these things may pass, and be performed even in this Assembly such as it is, and yet his majesty not made to approve any way the illegalities and nullities of it, for satisfying all his majesty's good subjects of the reality of his meaning, I am, by his majesty's special command, ready to do it, and content to advise with you how it may be done.'"

But now, the commissioner said, "the sad part was behind, viz. that since they had brought lay-elders to give voices in this Assembly,—a thing not practised before, or at least disused so long that no man present had seen it,—the ministers sitting here as commissioners were chosen by lay-elders, a thing never heard of before in this church; all the persons having voices here were, before the elections, designed by the Tables at Edinburgh; all others, by their express directions, barred: these few commissioners sent hither, but not chosen according to their designature, were, by their cavils, made for that purpose, set aside, and not admitted to have voices, the bishops cited hither were to be judged by the very same persons who had prejudged and condemned them at their Tables. He attested heaven and earth whether this could be imagined to be any way a free Assembly; and, therefore, called God to witness, that they themselves were the cause, and the only cause, why this Assembly could not have that happy issue which we heartily wished. And, why? the bishops could receive no censure from them, in regard to these their sinister proceedings; for how could any man expect justice from them who had denied it to us in refusing voices to our commissioners' assessors, which was never denied to our royal father, when he called more assessors than we did now? Much more to

this purpose was delivered by our commissioner; upon all which he commanded and required them not to proceed any farther in this Assembly; and declared, that whatsoever they should say or do hereafter in it, he in our name protested against it, and *that it should never oblige any of our subjects, nor be imputed for an act of this Assembly*[1]."

Here the marquis caused his majesty's commissions to be read, as they had been formerly proclaimed, and protested that, by producing and signing them, he had made known his majesty's intentions; and now, in delivering them, he had disclaimed the lawfulness of the Assembly. He then went on to show the illegality of the lay-elders, and the manifest inconsistency of their being greater in number than the ministers:—"But now I am sorry I can go on with you no more, for the sad part is yet behind about ruling [lay] elders; for neither ruling elders, nor any minister chosen commissioner by ruling elders, can have voice here; because no such election is warranted either by the laws of this church or kingdom, or by the practice or custom of either; for even that little which appeareth to make for those elders in the Book of Discipline, hath by this time been broken by you, there being *more lay elders giving votes* at any one of these elections *than there were ministers*, CONTRARY *to the Book of Discipline*. . . . . But, say there were law for those lay-elders, the interruption of the execution of that law for above forty years makes so strong a prescription against it, that without a new reviving of that law, by some new order from the General Assembly, it ought not again to be put in practice; for if his majesty should put in practice, and take the penalties of any disused laws, without new intimations of them from authority, it would be thought by yourselves very hard dealing.

"To say nothing of that office of lay-elders, it being unknown to the Scriptures, or church of Christ for above fifteen hundred years, let the world judge whether those laymen be fit to give votes in inflicting the censures of the church, especially that great and highest censure of excommunication; none having power to *cast out* of the church by that censure, but those who have power to *admit into* the church by baptism; and whether all the lay-elders, here present at this Assembly, be fit to judge of the high and deep mysteries of predestination,—of the universality of redemption,—of the sufficiency of grace given, or not given, to all men,—of the resistibility of grace,—of total and final perseverance or apostacy of the saints,—of the anti-

[1] Large Declaration, p. 279-80.

lapsarian or postlapsarian opinions,—of election and reprobation;—all which they mean to ventilate, if they do determine against the Arminian, as they give out they will.

"In many presbyteries these lay-elders disagreed in their elections wholly, or for the most part, from the ministers, and carried it from them by number of votes; though, in all reason, the ministers themselves should best know the abilities and fitness of their brethren. . . . .

"How can these men, now elected, be thought fit to be ruling elders who were never elders before, all, or most part of them, being chosen since the indiction of the Assembly; some of them but the very day before the election of their commissioners; which demonstrates plainly, that they were chosen *only to serve their associates' turn* at this Assembly?

"Since the institution of lay-elders, by your own principles, is to watch over the manners of the people in the parish in which they live, how can any man be chosen a ruling elder from a presbytery who is not an inhabitant within any parish of that presbytery, as hath been done in divers elections, against all law, sense, or reason?

"By what law or practice was it ever heard that young noblemen, or gentlemen, or others, should be chosen rulers of the church, being yet minors, and in all construction of law thought unfit to manage their own private estates, unless you will grant, that men of meaner abilities may be thought fit to rule the church, which is the house of God, than are fit to rule their own private families and fortunes?

* * * * * * * *

"This introducing of ruling elders is a burthen so grievous to the brethren of the ministry, that many of the presbyteries have protested against it for the time to come; some for the present; as shall appear by divers protestations and supplications ready to be here exhibited.

"For the ministers chosen commissioners hither, besides that the fittest are passed by, and some chosen who were never commissioners of any Assembly before, that so they might not stand for their own liberty in an Assembly of the nature whereof they are utterly ignorant, choice hath also been made of some who are under the censure of the church; of some who are deprived by the church; of some who have been banished and put out of the university of Glasgow, for teaching their scholars that monarchies were unlawful; some banished out of this kingdom for their *seditious sermons and behaviour*; and some, for the like offences, banished out of Ireland; some

lying under the fearful sentence of excommunication; some having no ordination nor imposition of hands; some admitted to the ministry contrary to the standing laws of this church and kingdom;—all of them chosen by lay-elders! What a scandal were it to the reformed churches to allow this to be a lawful Assembly, consisting of such members, and so unlawfully chosen!

"Of this Assembly divers who are chosen are at the *horn*, [*i. e.* under a writ of outlawry]; and so, by the laws of this kingdom, are incapable of sitting as judges in any judicatory.

* * * * * * * *

"You have cited the reverend prelates of this land to appear before you by a way unheard of, not only in this kingdom, but in the whole christian world, their citations being read in the pulpits, which is not usual in this church; nay, and many of them were read in the pulpits after they had been delivered into the bishops' own hands. How can his majesty deny unto them, being his subjects, the benefit of his laws, in declining all those to be their judges who, by their covenant, do hold the principal thing in question—to wit, episcopacy—to be abjured, as many of you do? or any of you to be their judges who do adhere to your last protestation, wherein you declare that it is an office not known to this kingdom, although at this present it stands established both by acts of parliament and acts of General Assemblies? Whoever heard of such judges as have sworn themselves parties? And if it shall be objected, that the orthodox bishops in the first four and other general councils could not be deemed to be competent judges of the heretics, though beforehand they had declared their judgments against these heretics, it is easily answered, that in matters of heresy no man must be patient, since in fundamental points of faith a man cannot be indifferent without the hazard of his salvation, and therefore must declare himself to be on Christ's side, or else he is against him: but in matters of church government and policy, which, by the judgment of this church, in the 21st Article of our Confession, are alterable at the will of the church, it is not necessary for any man who means to be a judge, to declare himself, especially against that government which stands established by law at the time of his declaration; being not only not necessary, but likewise not lawful at that time for him so to do. Now, this declaration all you who adhere to the last protestation have made, even since you meaned to be the bishops' judges. Besides, even those ortho-

dox fathers never did declare themselves against the heretics, their persons or callings, by oaths and protestations, as you have done; for that had been a prejudging them, and this *prejudying in you* makes you now to be *incompetent judges*.

"Upon the whole matter, then, there are but two things left for me to say: first, you yourselves have so proceeded in the business of this Assembly, that it is impossible the fruits so much wished and prayed for can be obtained in it; because, standing as it does, it will make the church ridiculous to all the adversaries of our religion; it will grieve and wound all our reformed churches who hear of it; it will make his majesty's justice traduced throughout the whole christian world, if he should suffer his subjects, in that which concerns their callings, their reputations, and their fortunes, *to be judged by their* SWORN ENEMIES. If, therefore, you will dissolve yourselves, and amend all these errors in a new election, I will with all convenient speed address myself to his majesty, and use the utmost of my intercession with his sacred majesty for the indiction of a new Assembly, before the meeting whereof all these things now challenged may be amended: if you shall refuse this offer, his majesty will then declare to the whole world *that you are the disturbers of the peace of this church and state*, both by introducing of lay-elders *against the laws and practices* of this church and kingdom, and by going about to abolish episcopal government, which at this present *stands established* by both the said laws: two points (I dare say), and you must swear it, if your conscience be appealed to (as was well observed by that reverend gentleman we heard preach the last Sunday) which these you drew into your covenant were never made acquainted with at their entering into it; much less could they suspect that these two should be made the issue of this business, and the two stumbling-blocks to make them fall off from their natural obedience to their sovereign[1]."

Henderson made a long speech in reply to the lord commissioner, "*well penned*, which he had *in readiness* whensoever the Assembly should be dissolved;" wherein, says Burnet, "he said much to the magnifying of the king's authority in matters ecclesiastical, calling him *the universal bishop of the churches in his dominions*, with other such-like expressions, which gave no small *disgust* to many of the zealous brethren." He vindicated the proceedings of the Assembly, and particularly in declaring themselves judges of the bishops. The charge against the bishops was one of the most scandalous

[1] Burnet's Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton.—Large Declaration, p. 280.

ever heard of in the christian church, for every one of them, except two who apostatised from covetousness, were charged with heresy, symony, perjury, incest, adultery, fornication, and breach of the Lord's day. These horrible accusations against men of blameless lives were the malignant libels of false traitors who had entirely succumbed to the god of this world, and hurried on that crisis for the base purpose of keeping possession of property procured by sacrilegious spoliation. The king says, "We shall desire the reader to observe their proceedings in one process, which we are confident was framed and pursued with such malice, injustice, falsehood, and scandal, not only to the reformed religion in particular, but to the christian religion in general, as it cannot be paralleled by any precedent of injustice in preceding ages, nor (we hope) shall ever be followed in future; and which, if it were known among Turks or infidels, would make them abhor the christian religion, if they did think it would either countenance or could consort with such abominable impiety and injustice[1]."

Henderson, of course, denied all the charges which the marquis had made against prejudging the bishops, and the prelimitation to the electors of the members. To which the marquis well replied, "As for your pretence of your unlimited freedom, you indeed refused so much as to hear from his majesty's commissioner of any prudent treaty for the preparing and right ordering of things before the Assembly; alleging that it could not be a free assembly where there was any prelimitation either of the choosers or of those to be chosen, or of things to be treated of in the Assembly, but that all things must be discussed upon the place, else the Assembly could not be free: but whether you yourselves have not violated that which you call freedom, let any man judge; for, besides these instructions, which it may be are not come to our knowledge, we have seen, and offer now to produce, *four several papers of instructions* sent from them whom you call the Tables, *containing all of them prelimitations*, and such as are not only repugnant to that which you call the freedom, but to that which is *indeed the freedom* of an assembly. Two of these papers were such as you were contented should be communicated to all your associates--to wit, that larger paper sent abroad to all presbyteries, immediately after his majesty's indiction of the Assembly, and that lesser paper for your meeting first at Edinburgh, then at Glasgow, some days before the Assembly; which paper gave order for choosing of assessors, and

[1] Large Declaration, p. 207.

divers other particulars: but your other two papers of *secret instructions* were directed, one of them only to one minister of every presbytery, to be communicated by him as he should see cause, but to be quite concealed from the rest of the ministers; the other paper was directed only to one *layman* of every presbytery, and to be communicated by him as he should see cause, *but to be quite concealed from all others*. In both which papers are contained such directions which, being followed, *as they were*, have quite banished all freedom from this Assembly, as shall appear by reading the papers themselves[1]."

The marquis then directed these secret instructions to be read, but which, of course, were disowned by the Assembly, as being merely the private opinions of some zealous individuals. But the elections having been all conducted according to these private instructions, it is an unquestionable proof, as the marquis said, that "they were sent by an authority which all feared to disobey." In conclusion, he said, "That for many months the Tables had been obeyed by all; but he would now make a trial what obedience they would give to the king's command; and protested that one of the chief reasons that moved him to dissolve this Assembly was to deliver the ministers from the tyranny of lay elders, who (if not suppressed) would (as they were now designing the ruin of episcopal power) prove not only ruling, but *over-ruling* elders[2]:"—"and withal added, that if they would now depart, he would be suited to us for the indiction of a new free General Assembly, in which they might moderate the faults committed by them in their proceedings in this."

It became now the marquis's imperative duty to dissolve the Assembly, and which he did in his majesty's name, and discharged their further proceedings under *pain of treason*: yet not without such sensible marks of grief, says Burnet, as affected all present. He likewise, in his own name and in that of the lords of the clergy, protested that no act there should imply his consent, or be accounted lawful or of force to bind any of his majesty's subjects. A rumour had been circulated in the morning, that it was his grace's intention to dissolve the Assembly, and the leading men had taken their measures accordingly. Lord Rothes presented a protest against the dissolution, and the earl of Argyle, who now began to throw off the mask which he had so long worn, presented

[1] Large Declaration, 281-284.
[2] Burnet's Memoirs of Dukes of Hamilton, lib. ii. 101-106.

another in the name of the presbyteries, universities, and burghs. After a long speech, to encourage the Assembly, the moderator put the question, "whether they would adhere to the protestation against the lord commissioner's departure, and continue constituted till all things needful were concluded, or not?" On the vote being taken, "the whole members promised heartily to abide, on all hazards[1]." The faithful historian must, however, record the names of sir John Carnegie, of Cathie, and the reverends Thomas Thoirs, John Watson, Joseph Brodie, John Annan, and Dr. Barron, who left the Assembly the moment that the commissioner dissolved it. The business of this session was concluded by the question, "whether the Assembly do find themselves lawful and competent judges to the pretended archbishops and bishops of this kingdom, and the complaints given in against them and their adherents, notwithstanding of their declinature and protestation?" and the whole Assembly voted *affirmatively*[2].

The marquis summoned a council; yet so doubtful was he of their allegiance, that he dared not ask them to subscribe his proclamation for the dissolution of the Assembly, but procured their signatures separately next morning. His proclamation was read, on Thursday, the 29th of November, at the Market-cross, but which was immediately met with a protest by the earl of Rothes and others. The earl of Argyle also withdrew from the council and joined the Assembly, and sat there constantly until its close. Although he sat and voted in this Assembly as a lay-elder, yet he had never been elected as a member for any burgh or presbytery. He had the impudent effrontery to acknowledge his treachery, by openly saying in the Assembly, "that from the beginning he had been theirs, and would have taken *that cause by the hand* as soon as any of them did, had it not been that he conceived that his professing hitherto *for the king*, and going along with his council, *was more available to them than if he had declared himself at once for them*[3]."

"Always," says bishop Guthry, "Argyle's example, together with my lord commissioner's so quiet deportment, being in the midst of the country where his power lay, wrought so upon the lords of the council, and other noblemen also (who had formerly stood out), that many of them during the time of the Assembly, and others of them shortly after, joined to

[1] Stevenson's Church and State, p. 309.
[2] Balfour's Annals, ii. 303-4.—Guthry's Mem. 41.
[3] Stevenson's Ch. and State, 310.—Baillie's Letters, p. 115.

the covenanters[1]." The marquis considered their secession as rather advantageous than otherwise[2].

The privy council wrote to the king, and commended the marquis's zeal and diligence in his service; and he departed for his palace at Hamilton, and carried the three prelates with him, who had been in a manner imprisoned in the castle of Glasgow, in order to secure their personal safety from the excited fury of the populace. While taking horse, Spalding says, "the earl of Argyle, the earl of Rothes, and lord Lindsay, three pillars of the covenant, had some *privy* speeches with him, which drew suspicion that he was on their side[3]." From thence he went to Edinburgh, and despatched an account of the late proceedings of the Assembly to the king, and asked permission to wait on him. The king, in reply, acknowledged the marquis's services, and approved of his having dissolved the Assembly. The marquis also received two letters from archbishop Laud, in which he thanks him for his protection of the prelates from the fury of the people; and adds, "I heartily pray your lordship to thank both the bishop of Ross and the dean [of Durham, Balcanqual] for their kind letters, and the full account they have given me; but there is no particular that requires an answer in either of them, saving that I find in the dean's letter, that Mr. Alexander Henderson, who went all this while for a quiet and calm-spirited man, hath shewed himself a most violent and passionate man, and a moderator *without moderation*[4]."

No sooner had the commissioner retired, than the lord Erskine, eldest son of the earl of Mar, addressed the Assembly: "My lords, and the rest, my heart hath been with you; I will dally no more with God; I beg to be admitted into your blessed covenant, and pray you all to pray to God for me, that He would forgive me for dallying with him so long." Three other gentlemen desired the same, and they were all immediately admitted into this bond of rebellion, and "fore-runner of many woes." "These men were resolved to enter into their covenant long ago, but were on purpose for doing of it at that hour, for the greater glory of their covenant; for no sooner had they sworn, and the moderator received them by the hand, but presently he desired the whole audience to admire God's approbation and sealing of their proceedings, that even at that

[1] Guthry's Memoirs, 41. [2] Burnet's Memoirs, lib. ii. 107.
[3] Spalding's History of the Troubles in Scotland and England, i. 79.
[4] Burnet's Memoirs, lib. ii. 107—108.

instant, when they might have feared some shrinking and backsliding, because of the present rupture, He had moved the hearts of these men to beg admittance into their blessed society![1]"

1. Thursday, 29th of November, 1638.—This is called the *eighth* session of the Assembly; but as it was lawfully dissolved by the same authority that convoked it, this day must commence *de novo* another Assembly, which sat under the pain of rebellion, and in defiance of the king's authority, although they acknowledged his right to call and preside in all national Assemblies. The early part of this day was occupied in hearing the royal proclamation for the dissolution of the Assembly, at the Market Cross; which discharged and inhibited all the members of the said Assembly from further meeting, convening, treating, and consulting any thing belonging to the said Assembly, under the pain of treason. On its conclusion, Johnston of Warriston assisted the lord Erskine and others to read their protest, and peremptorily refused to dissolve the Assembly, for reasons which they then declared. After this formality the Assembly met as formerly, under the conduct of Henderson, the moderator "without moderation." After some other business, a committee was appointed "for consideration of the service-book, the book of canons and ordination, and the high commission, that it might be known to posterity what great mercy the Lord had showed in delivering us from them. As also that it might be known to the world, that the supplications against these books had been just, and that some monuments of their wickedness might be left to the generations following[2]."

2. The second-ninth session, Friday, the 30th November, was chiefly occupied in condemning the General Assemblies of Perth, St. Andrews, Glasgow, Linlithgow, and Aberdeen; and a committee was appointed in order to revise the registers, and "for putting the nullities of these Assemblies into a formal act[3]."

3. Saturday, the 1st December, was their third session, or the tenth according to their own calculation, when they put several clergymen upon their trial, *in absence*, for points of doctrine; and as a specimen of their doctrinal views we shall select the case

[1] Large Declaration, p. 287.

[2] Stevenson's Church and State, 310-318.—Baillie's Letters, 145-148.—Balfour's Annals, ii. 305.

[3] Baillie's Letters, 148.—Stevenson's Church and State 321.—Balfour's Anns. ii. 306, 307.

of Dr. Panther, who was professor of divinity in the New College, St. Andrews, and whom they condemned and deposed. It may not be beyond the bounds of charity to imagine that his chair in the University was coveted for a professor more to their own theological taste. In his case, "it was proven that, besides recommending Canterbury's method of study to our youth, viz. to begin with the popish schoolmen and fathers, and to close with protestants, a most unhappy and dangerous order, he had, in his notes, turned aside to the popish justification, and, in his discourses on original sin, to the grossest pelagianism, besides *other* points of Arminianism. On which, Mr Baillie observes, 'that though they [the ministers] were dumb, the heavens did cry for vengeance against the bishops, for suffering the church to be undermined with such instruments of their own making and maintaining[1].'"

4. Monday, December 3d, was their 4th-11th session. Mr. Mitchel, one of the clergy of Edinburgh, was, in absence, tried and found guilty of *heresy*, inasmuch as he had gloried in teaching universal grace and the universal efficacy of Christ's death, the resistibility of grace, and the falling away of the saints. These catholic verities, which more clearly develop the doctrines of the church at that time than any laboured confession of faith, were wound up with the usual charge of arminianism and popery, and of having declined the authority of this Assembly. He was unanimously found guilty of the heresy of holding sound catholic doctrines; and the moderator, being under that *strong delusion* which gives credit to a lie, pronounced sentence of deprivation "in the name of Jesus Christ, and in the name of *this* Assembly *convened in His name!*" The business of this session was concluded by reading a letter from the lord bishop of Orkney, apologizing that from age and sickness, and the length of the journey, he had been unable to obey their summons, but that he now submitted *simpliciter* to their judgment[2]! This was one of the Iscariot tribe, who unhappily, from covetous motives, came under our Lord's censure, "No man having put his hand to the plough, and *looking back*, *is fit for the kingdom of God*[3]." In his letter "he acknowledged the unlawfulness of his office, and declared his unfeigned sorrow and grief for his having exercised such a *sinful* office in the church; affirming the same to have no warrant from the Word of God, and to have been the occasion of many fearful and evil consequences, both in Scotland

[1] Stevenson's Church and State, 323.—Balfour's Annals, 307.

[2] Baillie's Letters, 151.—Stevenson's Church and State, 325, 326.—Balfour's Annals, ii. 307.

[3] St. Luke, ix. 62.

and other parts of Christendom: he therefore abjures all episcopal power and jurisdiction, *and swears by the great name of the Lord God*, while he lives never directly or indirectly to exercise that power in the kirk, or to approve or allow it so much as in discourse, either public or private[1]." "By this submission, being only deposed from his episcopal function, he was not excommunicated by the Assembly, as the far greater part of his brethren the bishops were; and thereby *he saved his estate of Gorthie, and the money he had upon bond*, which otherwise would all have fallen under escheat." Upon Graham's apostacy and renunciation of the episcopal office, the king appointed Dr. Robert Baron, Professor of Divinity in Marischall College, Aberdeen, "a man famous for his writings and other good qualifications;" but, being forced by the persecution of the times to leave the kingdom, he died at Berwick, and was never consecrated[2].

5. Tuesday, December 4th, was their fifth-twelfth session. The Reverends William Maxwell of Dunbar, and George Sydserf of Coburnspath, were deposed for the maintenance of sound catholic doctrines, and for appealing to the king against the tyranny of this Assembly. Dr. Gladstanes, son of the late archbishop and archdeacon of St. Andrews, was deposed "with one mouth" for the same cause. The last six General Assemblies which had been held under the late king's sanction and authority, and all of whose acts had been solemnly ratified in as many different parliaments, "were voiced with one consent" to be "NULLITIES." "The Assembly, with the universal consent of all, after the serious examinations of the reasons against every one of these pretended Assemblies apart, being often urged by the moderator to inform themselves thoroughly that, without doubting, and with a full persuasion of mind, they might give their voices, declared all these six Assemblies of Linlithgow, 1606 and 1608; Glasgow, 1610; Aberdeen, 1616; St. Andrews, 1617; Perth, 1618; and every one of them, to have been from the beginning unfree, unlawful, and null Assemblies, and never to have had, nor hereafter to have, any ecclesiastical authority, and their conclusions to have been and to be of no force, vigour, nor efficacy; prohibited all defence and observation of them, and ordained the reasons of their nullity to be inserted in the books of the Assembly[3]." Balfour says, that the archbishop of St. Andrews was unani-

[1] Nalson's Impartial Collection, i. 252.

[2] Keith's Catalogue of Scottish Bishops, p. 227.

[3] Johnston's Collections of Acts of Assembly, from 1638 to 1649, pp. 8 and 9. — Baillie.—Stevenson.— Balfour.

mously deposed in this session; but this act is not named by any other author.

6. Wednesday, December 5th, the sixth or thirteenth session. The moderator deduced from the Act of Nullity which was passed the preceding session, that they were *absolved* from their canonical oaths to the bishops, that presbyteries and Assemblies were restored to their rights, and that the ordinations and depositions by presbyteries passed lately without bishops were valid and legal[1]. The act declares that "the oaths and subscriptions exacted by the prelates of the intrants in the ministry all this time bypast (as without any pretext of warrant from the kirk, so for obedience of the acts of these null Assemblies, and contrary to the ancient and laudable constitutions of this kirk, *which never have been nor can be lawfully repealed*, but must stand in force,) to be unlawful and no way obligatory[2]." After having absolved themselves from their oaths, in the manner of the papists, they put Dr. Hamilton, procurator for the bishops, on his trial, *in absence*, and without any difficulty found him guilty of affronting the Assembly, by addressing their president, after the king had dissolved the meeting, as Mr. Henderson, minister of Leuchars, instead of moderator; of absence from his parish, seeking promotion; of profanation of the Sabbath; of ordinary swearing, and a violent persecutor in requiring his parishioners to communicate kneeling, &c. He was deposed and deprived of his parish, but of which he kept possession till he was forcibly driven away, when he fled to England for personal protection. John Chrichton, minister of Paisley, and several others, were deposed for maintaining catholic doctrines, but which were termed arminianism and popery[3].

7. Thursday, December 6th, the seventh or fourteenth session. "Many large and tedious treatises against the books were read. We got all thanks for our labours. A resolution was taken to put us all in print . . . . . and, indeed, there were *many things* in our pamphlets *might not well have abidden the light;* how well soever, at the first reading they pleased men unacquainted with that kind of study." In truth, they were so stuffed with uncharitable malignant railings against the bishops and orthodox clergy, that even the more sober of their own party were ashamed. "I took it ever for one of our party's greatest crimes," says Baillie, "that they cast all burdens on the back of our sweet prince yet, and themselves have never endeavoured to satisfy as many of their challenges, either by

[1] Baillie's Letters, i. p. 152. [2] Johnston's Collections, p. 15.
[3] Balfour's Annals, ii. 308.

maintaining them in reason, or confessing their errors by ingenuous repentance[1]."

Four acts or decrees were this day passed—against, first, the Liturgy; second, the Book of Canons; third, the Book of Consecration of Bishops, and Ordination of Priests and Deacons; fourth, the High Commission Court[2]. "The said books, by full consent of the Assembly, were rejected and condemned as popish, erroneous, and altogether destructive to the discipline established in the church of Scotland, and others of the best reformed churches of Europe[3]."

8. Friday, 7th of December, the eighth or fifteenth session. "The bishop of Dunkeld sent us, in writing, his simple dimission[4]." Alexander Lindsay was a son of Mr. Lindsay, of Evelick, and was promoted from the parsonage of St. Madoe's, in the Carse of Gowry, Perthshire, in the year 1607; and he now "renounced his office, abjured episcopacy, submitted to presbyterian parity, and accepted from the then rulers his former church of St. Madoe's[5]." "Thereafter," says Bailie, "the bishop's censures came thick upon us." Thomas Sydserf, bishop of Galloway, was accused of breach of the caveats, arminianism, of having a crucifix in his chamber, of professing more love for papists than for puritans, &c. John Spottiswood, archbishop of St. Andrews, and lord chancellor of the kingdom, was charged with, and, of course, found to have been guilty of, profaning the Sabbath, carding and dicing, riding through the country the whole day, tippling and drinking in taverns till midnight, falsifying the acts of Aberdeen Assembly, lying and slandering the old Assembly and Covenant in his wicked book, of adultery, incest, sacrilege, and frequent simony. He was deposed, and decreed to be excommunicated. They next arraigned Dr. Walter Whitford, bishop of Brechin, against whom they brought the usual list of crimes; and, in proof of their infamous breach of the ninth commandment, Bailie says, "also a woman and child brought before us, that made his adultery *very probable*." "The man *was reputed* to be universally infamous for many crimes; yet such was his impudence, that, it was said, he was ready to have compeared before us for his justification." This worthy and maligned man of course was ordered to be excommunicated[6]. He fled for preservation of his life into England, for, having been a zealous supporter of the liturgy, he was obnoxious to the furious covenanters.

[1] Bailie's Letters, 153.
[2] Johnston's Collections, 16-18.
[3] Balfour's Annals, ii. 309.
[4] Bailie's Letters, i. 154.
[5] Keith's Catalogue, 98.
[6] Bailie's Letters, &c. i. 155.

9. Saturday, 8th of December, the ninth or sixteenth session. The subject of discussion this day was respecting the lawfulness of episcopacy, and whether or not it was understood to be abjured in the covenant of 1580. Argyle stated that many entertained doubts in what sense the covenant of 1580 should be signed: he and others had subscribed it, at the king's command, in the sense in which it was understood in that year. But some alleged that episcopacy made at that time a part of the discipline of our church; whilst others considered that it was therein disavowed; therefore, as this Assembly was the fittest judge of that controversy, he proposed that these doubts should be removed by their decision. "This motion was thought reasonable; so, for clearing the minds of all, the clerk brought forth a large scroll as the labour of the committee, consisting of three parts:—1. Of reasons shewing the necessity to clear the sense of the covenant in the 1580 year; next a number of passages of our General Assemblies, from the 1576 to the 1596, and of our Book of Discipline, condemning episcopacy; thirdly, an answer to some objections. After reading of all this at leisure, the question was formed about the abjuration of all kinds of episcopacy in such terms as I profess I did not well in the time understand, and thought them so *cunningly intricate*, that hardly could I give any answer, either *ita* or *non*. To make any public dispute I thought it not safe, being myself alone, and fearing, above all evils, to be the occasion of any division, which was our certain wreck. The farthest I aimed at was, in voicing to declare shortly my mind: so when all men were called to propone what doubts they had, before the voicing, I, with all the rest, was as dumb as a fish. When it came to my name, many eyes were fixed on me, expecting some opposition; but all I said was,—That, according to the express words of the Assembly, 1580, 1581, episcopacy was to be distinguished: episcopacy as used and taken in the church of Scotland, I thought to be removed; yea, that it was a popish error, against Scripture and antiquity, and so then abjured: but episcopacy *simpliciter*, such as was in the ancient church, *and in our own church during Knox's days, in the person of the superintendents*, it was, for many reasons, to be *removed, but not abjured in our* confession of faith. This, Argyle and London, and *many*, took out of my mouth, as not ill said, and nothing against their mind, who spake not of episcopacy *simpliciter*, but in our own church, whether or not it had been condemned at the time of the covenant's first subscription. I replied no more; but if I had considered the moderator's stating of the question, as it *now* stands in print, I would have

said without any hesitation, that it did seem to me to be *Poluzetesis*, consisting at least of three much different questions, all which required divers answers. . . . . In voicing, many to the number of fifty and above, as some, who curiously remarked, did avow '*remove* episcopacy,' but said *nought* of their *abjuration*: yea, sundry of prime men there will yet avow that they never thought all episcopacy abjured in our church, notwithstanding all was taken for abjurers and removers by the clerk; and that very justly for answering affirmative to one part of the question, and negative to none, they ought to be taken as affirming the whole; yea, not one, when the question of abjuring came over again, as it did twice thereafter, would be plain; but all was content but poor I, to be counted abjurers. If any man, for any respect, did dissemble his judgment, his own heart knows; I will judge no man. That day was closed with hearty thanksgiving, for so great an harmony, in a matter of high consequence where no small discrepance was feared." In this transaction we have a full confession and decision, on an authority which presbyterians consider superior to the six first general councils, that Knox's superintendents were bishops; and more, that this Assembly did *not* abjure that particular episcopacy[1].

10. Monday, December 10th, the tenth-seventeenth session. The five articles of Perth were "in one voice totally abjured and removed." The bishops of Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Ross, and Dumblane, were all of them deposed from any function in the kirk, and to be excommunicated. Dumblane's crimes, by [over and above,] those that were general to all the bishops, were arminianism, popery, and drunkenness.

11. Tuesday, 11th of December, the eleventh-eighteenth session. George Graham, the apostate bishop of Orkney—a fallen Star—was deposed, but not excommunicated, on account of his submission. John Guthrie, bishop of Moray, was deposed; and if he acquiesced not with the said sentence, and made his repentance, but which he never did, to be excommunicated. Patrick Lindsay, archbishop of Glasgow, was deposed and excommunicated. James Fairlie, bishop of Argyle, was deposed; and if he did not acquiesce with his sentence and repent, to be excommunicated. Niel Campbel, bishop of the Isles, was deposed[2]. A number of the inferior clergy also were deprived of their livings for having yielded obedience to

[1] Baillie's Letters and Journals, i. 157-159.—Stevenson's Church and State, 303-333.—Balfour's Annals, ii. 309.

[2] Balfour's Annals, ii. 310.

the civil and ecclesiastical laws; and for having maintained sound catholic doctrines. They were accused of having preached baptismal regeneration, universal redemption, Christ's descent into hell, the real spiritual presence in the sacrament, and of having administered the elements to each individual with a benediction from within the rails of the altar, and made the people kneel[1]. This was the head and front of their offending, and which shews that they were confessors for the truth, and true disciples of Christ, that took up the cross and followed Him.

12. Wednesday, December 12th, the twelfth-nineteenth session. The Assembly deposed Alexander Lindsay, bishop of Dunkeld, from the office of bishop, and suspended him from the office and the exercise of the ministry, but to be received again, on his repentance, by the presbytery. John Abernethy, bishop of Caithness, received sentence of deposition from the episcopal office; but to be received into the office of the ministry upon his public profession of repentance to be made in the kirk of Jedburgh, and of which he was continued the minister. In consequence of their fears that the marquis of Hamilton intended to garrison the Castle of Edinburgh, Baillie says, "made them desire to see the Assembly at a short end; so, without farther delay, we decreed to pronounce the sentence of the bishops' deposition and excommunication to-morrow after sermon by the moderator[2]."

13. Thursday, December 13th, the thirteenth-twentieth session, in which the bishop of Dunblane was deposed. Alexander Henderson, the moderator, preached in the cathedral, from Psalm cx. ver. 1.—"Thereafter, in a very dreadful and grave manner, he pronounced their sentences. My heart was filled with admiration of the power and justice of God, who can bring down the highest and pour shame on them even in this world suddenly by a means all utterly unexpected, who will sin against him with an uplifted hand[3]." The following is a copy of the general sentence, and there was a particular sentence for each of the prelates, which rehearsed all the scandalous, false, and most malignant charges of immorality, which had been preferred against them.

"Sentence of deposition and excommunication against Mr. John Spottiswood, pretended archbishop of St. Andrews; Mr. Patrick Lindsay, pretended archbishop of Glasgow; Mr. David Lindsay, pretended bishop of Edinburgh; Mr. Thomas

[1] Baillie's Letters, i. 163—166.
[2] Baillie's Letters, i. 167.—Balfour's Annals, ii. 311. [3] Baillie, i. 169.

Sydserf, pretended bishop of Galloway; Mr. John Maxwell, pretended bishop of Ross; Mr. Walter Whitford, pretended bishop of Brechin.

"THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY having heard the libels [indictments] and complaints given in against the aforesaid pretended bishops to the presbytery of Edinburgh, and sundry other presbyteries within their pretended dioceses, and by the said presbyteries referred to the Assembly to be tried, the said pretended bishops being lawfully cited, oftentimes called, and their procurator, Dr. Robert Hamilton, and not compearing, but declining and protesting against this Assembly, as is evident by their declinature and protestation given in by the said Dr. Robert Hamilton, minister at Glasford, which, by the acts of Assembly, is censurable with summary excommunication: entered in consideration of the said declinature, and finding the same not to be relevant, but on the contrary to be a displayed banner against the settled order and government of this kirk, to be fraughted with insolent and disdainful speeches, lies, and calumnies against the members of this Assembly, proceeded to the cognition of the said complaints and libels against them; and finding them guilty of the breach of the cautions agreed upon in the Assembly holden at Montrose, anno 1600, for restricting of the minister voter in parliament from encroaching upon the liberties and jurisdiction of this kirk, which was set down with certification of deposition, infamy, and excommunication, especially for receiving of consecration to the office of episcopacy, condemned by the Confession of Faith and acts of this kirk, as having no warrant nor foundation in the word of God, and by virtue of this usurped power, and power of the High Commission, pressing the kirk with novations in the worship of God, and for sundry other heinous offences and enormities, at length expressed and clearly proven in their process, and for their refusal to underly the trial of the reigning slander of sundry other gross transgressions and crimes laid to their charge:—THEREFORE, the Assembly, *moved with zeal to the glory of God* and the purging of his kirk, hath ordained the said pretended bishops to be DEPOSED, and by these presents doth DEPOSE them, not only of the office of commissionary to vote in parliament, council, or convention, in name of the kirk, but also *of all functions*, whether of pretended episcopal or ministerial calling, *declareth them INFAMOUS*. And likewise ordaineth the said pretended bishops *to be EXCOMMUNICATED, and declared to be of those whom CHRIST commandeth to be holden by all and every one of the faithful as ETHNICKS and PUBLICANS*: and the sentence of excommunication to be pronounced by MR. ALEXANDER HENDERSON, moderator, in

face of the Assembly in the high kirk of Glasgow; and the execution of the sentence to be intimated in all the kirks of Scotland, by the pastors of every particular congregation, as they will be answerable to their presbyteries and synods, or to the next General Assembly, in case of the negligence of presbyteries and synods[1]."

14. Friday, 14th December, the fourteenth twenty-first session.—The earl of Wigton signed the covenant; five ministers were deprived and deposed from their ministerial office; and Henderson was removed from the church and parish of Leuchars to the better living of St. Giles's Church, Edinburgh[2].

15. Saturday, December 15th, the fifteenth twenty-second session.—Order was taken for the erection and jurisdiction of provincial synods: "Concerning kirk-sessions, provincial and national assemblies, the General Assembly, considering the great defection of this kirk, and decay of religion by the usurpation of the prelates, and their suppressing of the ordinary judicatories of the kirk, and clearly perceiving the benefits which will redound to religion by the restitution of the said judicatories, remembering, also, that they stand obliged by their solemn oath and covenant with God, to return to the doctrine and discipline of this kirk, &c. . . . . The Assembly findeth it necessary to restore, and by these presents restoreth, all these Assemblies unto their full integrity in their members, privileges, liberties, powers, and jurisdictions; as they were constituted by the aforesaid Book of Policy[3]."

16. Monday, 17th December, the sixteenth twenty-third session.—A visitation of the University of Glasgow was ordered, with power for the visitors, of which Mr. Baillie was one, to depose all orthodox and loyal men whom they should find in it.

17. Tuesday, 18th December, seventeenth twenty-fourth session.—This session was occupied with filling up the churches and parishes which had been declared vacant in former sessions. Furious covenanters were appointed to succeed those confessors who had been deprived for maintaining the truth. All titles of dignity, as deans, subdeans, chanters, &c. were abolished in all time coming. Archibald Johnston, the clerk, was elected procurator; and Robert Dalgleish to be agent for the kirk[4].

18. Wednesday, 19th December, the eighteenth twenty-fifth session.—Places were appointed for receiving bishops

[1] Johnston's Collection of Acts, pp. 18, 19.
[2] Balfour's Annals.—Baillie's Letters.
[3] Johnston's Collections of Acts, session 21, p. 11.
[4] Balfour's Annals.—Baillie's Letters.

who should be penitent! An act would have been passed for the apprehension and imprisonment of papists; but it was thought inexpedient, "lest it should give occasion to their desperate banding[1]." The children of this world are wise in their generation; and had the church been as familiar with the carnal sword as either the papists or the presbyterians, it appears that she would not have perished at this time, as, from her principle of non-resistance, she did perish.

19. Thursday, 20th December, nineteenth twenty-sixth and last session.—The moderator took a review of the proceedings of this Assembly, and congratulated the members upon the success which had attended that fundamental principle of the presbyterian religion—*resistance* to the powers that be[2]. To prevent discussion and the enlightenment of the people, the Assembly found it necessary to shackle the press, and the following act was passed:—

The Assembly, considering the great prejudice which God's kirk in this land hath sustained these years by-past by the unwarranted printing of libels, pamphlets, and polemics, to the disgrace of religion, slander of the gospel, infecting and disquieting the minds of God's people, and disturbance of the peace of the kirk; and remembering the former acts and customs of this kirk, as of all other kirks, made for restraining these and the like abuses, and *that nothing be printed concerning the kirk and religion* except it be allowed by those whom the kirk entrusts with that charge: the Assembly *unanimously, by virtue of their ecclesiastical authority*, dischargeth and inhibiteth all printers within this kingdom to print any act of the former Assemblies, any of the acts or proceedings of this Assembly, any confession of faith, any protestations, *any reasons pro or contra*, anent the present divisions and controversies of this time, or *any other treatise* whatsoever which may concern the kirk of Scotland or God's *Cause in hand*, without warrant subscribed by Mr. Archibald Johnston, as clerk to the Assembly and advocate for the kirk; or *to reprint, without his warrant*, any acts or treatises aforesaid, which he hath caused any other to print, under the pain of ecclesiastical censures, to be executed against the transgressors by the several presbyteries, and in case of their refusal, by the several commissioners from this Assembly: *Whereunto also we are confident the honourable judges of this land will contribute their civil authority;* and this to be intimated publicly in pulpit, with the other general acts of this Assembly[3].

[1] Baillie's Letters, i. p. 172. [2] Rom. xiii. 2.

[3] Johnston's Collection of Acts. Act Session, 26. Dec. 20, 1638.

The Assembly now rose, and the members dispersed, after a speech from the moderator, which he concluded with these words of fearful import: "*We have now cast down the walls of Jericho: let him that rebuildeth them beware of the curse of Hiel, the Bethelite*[1]." "The curse causeless shall not come:" on the contrary, we are told that they shall prosper that love Jerusalem. Henderson, who uttered the curse, could not himself fall under its blight, nor feel the sharpness of the serpent's tooth, which he so recklessly invoked on others; for he had neither "first-born" nor "youngest" to suffer for his enormous sacrilege; he was never married. Nevertheless, he had mercy shewn to him in this world, and the door of repentance was opened to him before he died, which, though late, it is to be hoped was effectual. This Assembly is the palladium of Scottish presbytery, and this "seditious presbyter," as Heylin very justly calls him, is reckoned the apostle of what they call the "SECOND REFORMATION." But we have seen by what means this reformation was effected; and the saying of Leslie can no longer be disputed, that "it is particularly remarkable of presbytery, that it never came yet into any country upon the face of the earth *but by rebellion*.—Let them shew that country or place in the world wherever presbytery entered, but by *erastianism*, by *lay* power and authority, by *lay* cannon, swords, and muskets[2]." Their own modern historian has conveyed in the following words a most just and severe censure upon this erastian Assembly of lay and clerical traitors: "There is here presented one of the many instances which occur in history of the inconsistency of human conduct. Had the king or the bishops acted in this respect as the covenanters did; had they suppressed every work hostile to prelacy and the opinions associated with it; how loudly would they have been reprobated by their opponents, as declaring war against the cause of truth and religion! Yet the moment that the people who would thus have complained ascend to the pinnacle of power, they proscribe every effort to examine their tenets by the test of reason or the principles of revelation[3]."

In the first introduction of the Solemn League and Cove-

[1] "In his days—namely, in those of Ahab, who did more to provoke the Lord God of Israel to anger than all the kings of Israel that went before him—did Hiel, the Bethelite, build Jericho: he laid the foundation thereof in Abiram his first-born, and set up the gates thereof in his youngest son Segub, according to the word of the Lord, which he spoke by Joshua, the son of Nun," 1 Kings, xvi. 34. "And Joshua adjured them at that time, saying, *Cursed* be the man before the Lord that riseth up and buildeth this city, Jericho; he shall lay the *foundation* thereof in his *first-born*, and in his *youngest son* shall he *set up the gates of it!*" Josh. vi. 26.

[2] Rehearsals, iii. 63 & 78. [3] Cook's History of the Church, ii. 472.

nant, the original framers of it made the most unbounded protestations of their attachment and adhesion to episcopacy, and they declared, especially to the lord commissioner, that their only object was to control and regulate, not to abolish it. In his dispute with the Aberdeen clergy, Henderson attempted to obviate their just fears that more and deeper designs were meant than met the ear, and he endeavoured to allay their well-founded apprehensions by saying, "You will have all the covenanters, against their intentions, and whether they will or not, to disallow and condemn the Articles of Perth and episcopal government: but it is known to many hundreds that the words were purposely conceived, for satisfaction of such as were of your judgment, that we might all join in one heart and one judgment." Notwithstanding this *special disclaimer*, this same individual, as moderator of an Assembly, "without moderation," condemned, anathematised, and imprecated the awful curse of Hiel the Bethelite, upon all, that, in obedience to God's holy will and commandments, continue stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship. "And now," says Mr. Skinner, "for this very man, from his usurped chair of infallibility, to condemn episcopacy, and notwithstanding of his insinuations to the contrary, only a few months before, to declare with such brazen effrontery 'that it was abjured in the covenant,' whatsoever it may say for Mr. Henderson's talents in conducting such business, is so flagrant a reflection on his honesty as cannot well be removed, even by that strange tenet which they have invented, in a defence of their proceedings, published by Warriston, in February next year, '*That the swearer is neither bound to the meaning of the prescriber of the oath, nor to his own meaning who takes the oath, but to the reality of the thing sworn, as it shall be afterwards interpreted by the competent judge*[1].'"

The sentence of these men against the bishops of the church of Scotland, and through them against all "the glorious company of the apostles" and "the goodly fellowship of the prophets" throughout the world, shows the poison of asps which was under their lips, their arrant hypocrisy, and their most malignant artifice. They charged the prelates with a list of the most heinous immoralities, some of which were of so gross a nature as to require not only ecclesiastical censures, but even condign punishment at the hand of the civil magistrate. Yet, as these general accusations served their purpose, they were no farther noticed than to be huddled up in a general and vague declaration of *scandalous offences*; leaving,

[1] Skinner's Ecclesiastical Hist. ii. 335.

however, the stigma of immorality upon these worthy confessors, than whom no set of men ever less deserved it. The original accusation of immorality was cushioned in the Assembly, and the head and front of the bishops' offence was placed in their holding that sacred office which Christ and his apostles had held and exercised, and to whom they could reach by a regular official ascent. How truly, in this instance, has Our Lord's words been verified: "Yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you [and your successors], will think that he doeth God service." Accordingly, Henderson asserted that they were *moved with ZEAL for the glory of GOD* in destroying those whom God hath declared to be as the stars in his right hand, and whose office he has promised to preserve to the end of the world. "And," says good Mr. Skinner, "this method of smothering an accusation which, if openly tried and proved, would have had more weight with the sensible part of the nation than any other part of the charge against them, is certainly a fuller vindication of the innocence and blameless behaviour of these persecuted prelates, than any laboured defence that could have been made for them. But this was not the only instance of arrogance, as well as artifice, which this Assembly exhibited; for on the morrow after this proclamation, they had the boldness, publicly at the market-cross, to 'summon and cite all those of his majesty's council, or any others who have procured, consented, subscribed, or ratified his proclamation, to be responsible to his majesty and three estates of parliament, for their counsel given in this matter, so highly importing his majesty and whole realm, protesting for remedy of law, against them and every one of them.' And to crown all, before they rose . . . . . they very confidently ordered a letter to be drawn up and sent to the king, for obtaining his royal assent to what they had done: as if, in slighting his proclamations, and obstinately continuing their judicatory against his will, formally notified to them by his commissioner, they had done nothing but what became good and dutiful subjects[1]."

This rebellious Assembly levelled to the ground, "at one fell swoop," the whole of the pious labours of the late king's reign, and revived the distinguishing doctrine of popery and presbytery, the supremacy of the ecclesiastical authority over the civil power. James compelled them to retract this dangerous and unconstitutional doctrine, but the party had always nourished it in secret, and they seized the first favourable opportunity to repossess themselves of it.

[1] Skinner's Eccl. Hist. ii. 337, 338.—Johnston's Collections, p. 66-71.

CHAPTER XV.

CONCLUSION.

Intrigues of Cardinal Richlieu and the Jesuits.—Possessors of the ecclesiastical property.—The real cause of the rebellion.—The papal dispensing power imitated.—Manner of electing the members of the Assembly.—Lay elders.—The high commissioner—accused of treachery—an instance.—First interview of Montrose with the king—and court intrigue.—Montrose joins the covenanters.—The deposing doctrine, whence derived.—The object of all rebellion.—Large Declaration.—The first grounds of discontent.—Certain advantages in extemporary prayers.—James determined to improve the worship of his native church—and gave orders for the compilation of a liturgy.—Charles followed out his father's intentions.—His error—his reason for thinking a liturgy would be acceptable—the cause of his ruin.—The history of the expatriated bishops traced—their letter to the king, and his answer.—Proposal to murder archbishop Spottiswood.—His illness—his interview with the marquis of Hamilton—his confession of faith—his death—buried in Westminster Abbey—his character.—Archbishop Lindsay.—Bishop Lindsay, of Edinburgh.—Bishop Bellenden, of Aberdeen.—Bishop Whitford, of Brechin.—Bishop Wedderburn, of Dunblaine.—Bishop Abernethy, of Caithness.—Bishop Campbell, of the Isles.—Bishop Fairly, of Argyle.—Bishop Guthrie, of Moray.—Bishop Maxwell, of Ross—made bishop of Killala—and archbishop of Tuam.—Bishop Sydserf, of Galloway—exercised his office at Paris.—Spanheim and Diodati's letters.—The Scottish bishops left no successors.—Conclusion.

Cardinal Richlieu and the jesuits had a large share in exciting this rebellion; but they only stepped in to foment the causes which already existed for this most wicked and tyrannical revolution. When Korah raised his voice against Moses and Aaron, he was backed by Dathan and Abiram, laymen princes of the Assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown: so, in this case, the complaints of the few ministers who were dissatisfied with the episcopal government would have evaporated in mere grumbling, and would have been confined to protesting, had not the nobility, with their puissant military retainers, made use of the ministers as mere tools, under pretence of great zeal for the glory of God and the safety of the church. Every one of the noblemen and barons who took such an active part at the Tables and the Assembly, were

possessed of large estates, which had formerly belonged to the church before the era of the Reformation. And none of them, perhaps, were more deeply implicated in that sacrilege than the earl of Argyle, who pretended to so much zeal, and acted as a DICTATOR during the whole period of the grand rebellion. His ancestor, the fifth earl of Argyle, received the whole of the lands which belonged to the three bishopries of Argyle, the Isles, and also of Brechin!

Almost all the ancient nobility had participated in the plunder of ecclesiastical property, except those noblemen who remained firm in their obedience to the Roman See. Many others got the church lands erected into temporal lordships; and a minute inquiry into the history of the sixteenth century would shew, that the plunder of the church was shared by the ancestors of almost all the ancient Scottish nobility, and many others besides, who favoured the Protestant cause then, from selfish motives, and now their sons rushed into the guilt of rebellion to keep that which had been at first sacrilegiously obtained. This was the real cause of the religious disturbances at that time; the liturgy and the episcopal government were merely made pretences, as the ministers would not have adopted the *real* views of the lay chiefs, although they readily entered heartily into any cause for the glory of God, and "for Christ's crown and covenant." HYPOCRISY was one of the reigning sins of the times; and it was most disgustingly exhibited by the leading men, both lay and ministerial, among the covenanters. This sin, together with the immoral obligations of the covenant itself, for a time completely demoralized the greater part of the nation. The papal power of *dispensing* with the obligation of oaths was assumed by the Glasgow Assembly, and Alexander Henderson *absolved* all the inferior clergy from their canonical oaths to their respective bishops.

But the JESUITS were deeply implicated in the events of this period; and those men who were most vociferous against popery sought and obtained assistance from the jesuits, and who were most active in promoting all the iniquitous proceedings which then disgraced the page of history, and even supplied the presbyterians with a copy for their covenant. A respectable author says, "Charles had true notions of the balance of power on the continent. He was sensible of Richlieu's ambition, and his dangerous views; and after-events proved that he was right in transferring his jealousy from the house of Austria to that of Bourbon. Richlieu had gained the prince of Orange and the States-general, and had formed a plan of making himself master of the Austrian Netherlands. The naval power of Charles, who

was at this time looked upon as a formidable prince, was the only check which Richlieu dreaded in his attempt. In order to remove it, he sent over D'Estrades, an able negociator, in the year 1637, to offer Charles his own terms if he would but remain neutral; but, above all, to make the queen his friend, and to offer her any thing she could demand from her brother. It is to the honour of Charles that, though he was fond of his wife even to weakness, he reprimanded her for talking even of a neutrality for Flanders—even though D'Estrades, in his master's name, promised that Charles should be assisted by a body of French troops in reducing his rebel subjects. This denial did not discourage D'Estrades; to whom Charles declared, in an audience he gave him, that he was so far from such a neutrality, that he was determined to have a fleet in the Downs ready to act, and with 15,000 troops on board, which he would land in Flanders in case of need. Charles then thanked Richlieu for his offers, but said that he had no occasion for any foreign assistance to reduce his subjects, if they should fail in their duty; his own authority and the laws being sufficient to keep them in awe.

"Richlieu's pride was offended with this spirited declaration; and D'Estrades had orders to tamper with some Scotchmen, particularly a lord and a clergyman, who were then at the English court, but were so little considered that they had not been able to obtain access to Charles. Richlieu approved of what D'Estrades had done: and his letter to that minister sufficiently accounts for the springs of the Scotch troubles at that time. 'I will pursue,' says he, 'the advice which you have given me as to Scotland, and will immediately despatch thither the abbé Chambers, my almoner, who is himself a Scotchman, and who shall go to Edinburgh to wait upon the two persons you have named to me, and to enter into a negociation with them. Before the end of twelve months the king and queen of England shall repent their having refused the offers which you made them from his majesty. If,' continues he, with the same strain of insolence, 'God blesses our undertaking, his majesty will have no great reason to regret that England has rejected his offers. You could not have spoken better, nor could you have better answered the king of England on my account. They shall soon know that I am not despicable. If your two Scotch friends are yet in London, tell them to trust to whatever may be communicated to them by the abbot Chambers; and give them a letter from yourself to that abbot, which will serve as a signal to introduce them to his company. You have done an *important service* to his majesty by finding out

these two men. Assure them of my affection and protection.' Charles did not suspect those hidden dangers, which came from a haughty popish prelate confederated with Scotch covenanters. Richlieu's emissaries tampered with Leslie, who had served with so much reputation under Gustavus Adolphus, but whom Charles, on account of his station, refused to treat as a gentleman; and 100,000 crowns of French money were deposited in his hands for the use of the covenanters[1]."

From what we have seen of the manner in which the Glasgow Assembly was elected, no reasonable person could call it either free or lawful. As the law stood, the clergymen composing the presbyteries elected one or more of their own number to represent them in the Assembly, and their election was subject to the control of the bishop, and *no lay person* whatever had any voice in the matter. But the Tables, sitting in Edinburgh, regulated the whole of the elections, to the entire exclusion of the just influence of the clergy. Laymen elected, or rather appointed, such fanatical ministers as they knew would answer their designs; and, moreover, they forced lay-elders into the Assembly, as constituent members, contrary to law, as they had been set aside for more than forty years previously. In their protest against the royal proclamation which dissolved them, they justified their disobedience by an appeal to some of the practices of the worst Assemblies in the time of Andrew Melville. At the same time, they were most lavish in taking their Maker's name in vain, by appeals to him to witness their loyalty and affection for their sovereign, at the very time that they were actually engaged in the most deliberate acts of treason against his crown and dignity.

The marquis of Hamilton was an irresolute man, and without that confidence in himself that is requisite for one placed in the position that he was in such times, and among such designing artful men. Indeed, bishop Guthry does not scruple to accuse him of direct treachery; and, truly, his remarkable duplicity towards Montrose and some others, which he relates, along with his habitual wavering and irresolute public conduct, gives great probability to the following incident. The bishop states, that after the marquis's first conference with the covenanter chiefs and ministers, in presence of the privy council at Dalkeith, he "himself convoyed them through the rooms, and stepping into the gallery, drew them into a corner, and then expressed himself as follows:—'My lords and gentlemen, I spoke to you before these lords of council as the king's commis-

[1] Guthry's General History of Scotland, ix. 258.

sioner; now, there being none present but ourselves, I speak to you as a kindly Scotchman: *If you go on with courage and resolution you will carry what you please;* but if you faint, and give ground in the least, you are undone—a word is enough to wise men[1]." It is painful to believe such treachery of the commissioner; but the story was never contradicted, the report became public, and no doubt assisted greatly to raise the spirits of the rebels. Nalson, also, concurs with Heylin, in accusing him of treachery, and of having been the cause of driving the gallant Montrose into the ranks of the disaffected.

The rebel chiefs "made great use of some persons about the king, from whom they received constant intelligence; amongst whom *the marquis of Hamilton* was suspected, by the king's friends, and even accused of being *one of the chief;* and, that I may not without ground seem to sully the memory of so great a person,—not to insist upon the ambition he was accused of by those about the court, and Ramsay's drinking his health by the name of *James the Seventh!* his underhand dealings to the king's disadvantage with the covenanters, and his taking letters out of the king's pockets,—there is a remarkable passage in the '*Observations upon the History of King Charles, written by H. L.*, p. 205,' which, the author avers, came from the mouth of the earl of Montrose to the king, and which seems confirmed by concurrent circumstances; which, if true, will plainly show how much the king lost by making him his confidant, and how much the faction advantaged themselves by having their party so near the king as was the marquis, the earl of Manchester, the lord Say, Sir Henry Vane, and several others of the Scottish nation. The story is this:—

"James, earl of Montrose, coming out of France, had a great inclination to put himself into his majesty's more immediate service, and for this purpose made his application to Hamilton. The marquis, who knew the gallantry of the person, and feared a competitor in his majesty's favour, told the earl that he would do him any service, but that the king was so wholly given up to the English, and so slighted and discountenanced the Scottish nation, that were it not for doing service to his country,—which the king intended to reduce to the form of a province,—he could not suffer the indignities which were put upon him. This done, he repairs to the king, tells him of the earl's return from France, and of his purpose to attend him at the time appointed; but that he was so powerful, so popular, and of such esteem among the Scots, by reason of an old

[1] Guthry's Memoirs, 34, 35.

descent from the royal family, that, if he were not nipped in the bud, he might endanger the king's interest and affairs in Scotland. The earl being brought to the king, with very great demonstrations of affection on the marquis's part, the king, without taking any great notice of him, gave him his hand to kiss, and so turned aside; which so confirmed the truth of that false report which Hamilton had delivered to him, that, in great displeasure and disdain, he makes to Scotland, where he found those who knew how to work on such humours as he brought along with him, till, by seconding the information which they had from Hamilton, the covenanters fashioned him wholly to their will and designs[1]."

On another occasion, also, Nalson gives the letter of a Mr. Andrew Kipping, a physician, addressed to the secretary-of-state, in which Kipping directly accuses the marquis of high treason, on the authority of "one Chrighton, a Scot, pretending himself a servant to the earl of Traquair; who declared to the said Kipping that the marquis of Hamilton was the archest traitor that ever betrayed any king since Adam; that he had recourse to London in the Tower, and private discourse; that he procured of the king his enlargement, . . and after brought him to kiss the king's hand, and to be sent with a commission into Scotland, to reduce the Scots into obedience; . . . that the last year, in Scotland, he told the covenanting lords he had no commission to fight, (which was a sufficient intimation to them,) and that the lords came daily to him, and had conference with him; . . . that Traquair is a dangerous covenanter; . . that marquis Hamilton lays claim to the crown[2]," &c.

Argyle and the covenanters adopted the genuine popish doctrine of deposing heretical kings; and his three causes for deposition, which are afterwards stated, are only a repetition of the papal doctrine. Bellarmine and other jesuits claim the power of deposition for the pope, and the covenanters claimed the same power for the people, and both for the same cause—the maintenance of true religion against popery and fanaticism. The covenanters and their abettors were taught this antichristian doctrine by their instigators, the jesuits, as bishop Burnet has very well said, in his sermon on the 30th January, 1680, where he says, "The resolving all power in the people was first taken up by the assertors of the pope's *deposing* power; for they argued, that if it belonged to the people, then the pope, representing the universal church, all their rights did accrue to him; so that, in their names, he was to

[1] Nalson's Impartial Collection, i. 63. [2] Ibid. i. 376.

dispose of crowns as he pleased." The object of all rebellion is for *power;* which, in addition to the retention of their sacrilegiously gotten wealth, was the real spring of the rebellion with the nobles. Rebellion was the sin which cast Lucifer out of heaven; and it is the sin to which he most chiefly tempts all the sons of Adam in every condition of life. If we desire to enter into heaven, we must keep the commandments; but obedience to our princes is one of them, and which is recommended to our attention by a promise, and forbidden to be broken by the menace of eternal damnation. Therefore, although these over zealous covenanters had kept nine-tenths of the law, yet, as they offended so grievously in this one point, they were as guilty as if they had broken the whole law of God; and so they incurred the fearful denunciation of the apostle. Charles said, very justly, in the Large Declaration, "That the contrivers and pursuers of the late wicked covenant, though they pretended religion, yet intended nothing less. . . . . That these pretenders to reformation proceeded in such a way as tended to the apparent ruin both of the reputation and religion of the reformation; and that the pope and conclave, and the jesuits, could not have proposed any method more effectual to reduce these kingdoms to the Roman obedience; that the covenanters, in their sermons and seditious pamphlets, *made use of the maxims* of the jesuits, the very style and phrase of Becanus, &c., and transcribed arguments verbatim out of Bellarmine and Suarez, endeavouring with those, and jesuitical fables, false reports, prophecies, and pretended inspirations, to delude the populace, and unhinge them from their loyalty and allegiance."

The first ground of discontent was his majesty's legal revocation of such property as had been plundered and had passed away, to the prejudice of the crown, during the two previous minorities. The next was the commission granted by the crown for relieving the clergy in point of maintenance, and the inferior laity from the grinding oppression of the lords of erection, or the impropriators of the tithes. By virtue of this commission a rate was set upon the tithes, and they were purchased by the owners, so that the lords of erection were sufficiently compensated for their rights; and the ministers' livings were augmented, and themselves freed from the dangerous and mercenary slavery to which they had been subjected. The proprietors of land and the clergy were well satisfied with the issue of this commission; for the one had their livings improved, and the others were relieved from an intolerable slavery and dependence on their fellow subjects. The nobility

and the other lay patrons also seemed outwardly satisfied, but in private they were exceedingly discontented and dissatisfied "to be robbed of the clientele and dependence of both clergy and laity upon them, and not being able to fix their discontent at these proceedings, as either affronting or weakening religion, they betook themselves to their old artifice, giving out that this commission was procured only by the bishops, who meant no good to religion. . . . . So that the grounds of the sedition appear plainly to be—first, his majesty's revocation; secondly, the commission of surrendries; and lastly, denying honours to some persons at his majesty's coronation[1]."

The fiery and undutiful spirits that had been bred in the school of Melville saw the advantage which the extemporary mode of worship gave them, of glancing at all the political topics, private gossip, and uncharitable suspicions which then prevailed. It likewise enabled them to rail on the king and his ministers to their faces, without the fear of contradiction, or of being called in question for their disloyalty. In short, their prayers deserved more the name of oblique sermons, designed to inflame the minds of their hearers against the government, and which they frequently most completely effected, than of solemn penitential addresses to God. A liturgy is an admirable defence against all such indecorous and sinful courses in our addresses to the throne of grace; and any precomposed form of prayer is sure to be more judiciously framed, and free from the agitation of violent or political sentiments, than extemporary addresses hit off in the midst of contention, political agitation, and party spirit.

King James was long subjected to this species of persecution, and was daily insulted at public worship by the coarse invectives, and the insolent and uncharitable reflections of the preachers in his day, in their extemporary effusions. On his accession to the crown of England, he saw and admired the decency and uniformity of the liturgy, and was struck with its excellence. He naturally drew a parallel betwixt the chastened grandeur, sober dignity, energy, sublimity of thought, and the simplicity of expression, of its composition, with the poor, imbecile, and seditious addresses to which he had been compelled to listen in his native kingdom. The comparison made the extemporary worship the more odious, when he returned to Scotland after several years' absence. He, therefore, as became a religious prince, conceived a strong desire to redress the evil, and to endeavour to establish an uniform liturgy and ser-

[1] Large Declaration.

vice in the church of Scotland. James's pious design met with some opposition, and much delay, from various causes; but in the Assembly at Aberdeen, in August 1616, an act was passed for the compilation of a liturgy. William Cooper, bishop of Galloway, with several learned and devout clergymen, were appointed for its preparation. The archbishop of St. Andrews perused and revised the copy which they had prepared, and sent it up to James for his approbation; who was satisfied, and returned it to the archbishop with his full consent; but the demise of the crown interrupted the progress of the good work, and eventually it was entirely laid aside.

Moved by the same pious and princely designs which had actuated his father, Charles determined to follow out his purpose of settling a public liturgy in the church of Scotland. He caused the English liturgy to be revised, and to be cautiously adapted so as not to give the papists an opportunity of upbraiding the Anglo-catholic church with any material difference in our liturgies, and yet that, by some immaterial alterations, it might be justly reputed a distinct national liturgy. But Charles's error lay in sending this unexceptionable formulary to be adopted solely on the authority of his privy council and his own proclamation, without the ecclesiastical countenance and establishment of a synod of the church. This error was quickly perceived and improved by the impropriators of the tithes, and of which they instantly made a stalking-horse to arouse the passions, the prejudices, and the ignorant zeal of the people. Charles says, he had many reasons to induce him to believe that the Scottish church would not dislike the liturgy, which he designed for its edification.

"First, because many persons of the best quality of the subjects of Scotland, frequently resorting to his majesty's chapel-royal and other churches in London, were present at, and did with reverence demean themselves at, divine service; which made it probable that at home they would not account that unlawful and antichristian in it, as many of them have done since, with which they did here voluntarily comply.

"Secondly, the English liturgy had been read in his majesty's chapel at Holyrood House, from the year 1617, without dislike; to which the council, nobility, bishops, clergy, judges, gentry, burgesses, and women of all ranks, resorted. The bishops made use of it in ordinations in some cathedrals, and in the new college at St. Andrews, and it was used in all places whither his majesty resorted whilst in that kingdom, to which great numbers of all sorts of people resorted, without the least dislike of it, or complaints against it.

"Thirdly, that book being in substance the same with the English liturgy, no charges of idolatry, popery, or superstition, could be objected against the one which would not reflect upon the other: now the compilers of the English liturgy being such bishops and others as were either burnt or banished in queen Mary's days, and even, by these enemies of the service-book, esteemed glorious martyrs and sufferers for the reformation, they could neither with conscience or honesty be charged with framing a liturgy stuffed with idolatry, popery, or superstition: none have more learnedly and vigorously opposed idolatry or superstition than the English bishops and clergy, ever since the reformation[1]."

Charles had not only ignorant and bigotted fanatics, but ambitious and powerful nobles, with their feudal military vassals, to deal with; and he entirely mistook the right method of managing them. He commanded where he should have instructed and persuaded; and he temporized and vacillated where he ought to have been "bloody, bold, and resolute," to enforce obedience. Charles's great misfortune, and indeed it was the visible cause of his ruin, was, that he had too much clemency, and too sadly misplaced it. He showered all his favours upon his enemies, whom he vainly attempted to reclaim and attach to his person and government; and he disgusted and alienated his friends without being able to reclaim his enemies, who could never forgive or trust to him; for it is he who *does* the injury that never forgives. Charles preferred all the heads of the rebellion, and complied with all their demands, consented to the *extirpation* of the church, agreeable to the vow and intention of the covenant, and to the establishment of presbytery, for both of which he afterwards expressed the most lively and sincere repentance.

It remains only to trace the progress of the expatriated bishops, who were, now that "treason had done its worst," no longer able to serve the king or the church in any capacity. As mentioned before, the covenanters proposed, and really intended, to have murdered archbishop Spottiswood, at Stirling; but his life was spared more from the prudential fears of the covenanted chiefs than from any motives of honour or justice. Bishop Russell has inserted, in a note to his History, an anonymous letter from one who was known to Johnston of Warriston, dated 28th October, 1638, in which he very significantly hints at the propriety of assassinating the primate; and with the hypocrisy of the party, prays for a blessing on

[1] Large Declaration, p. 19-21.

the foul deed. "Dear christian brother and courageous protestant,—Upon some rumour of the prelate of St. Andrews, his coming over the water, and finding it altogether inconvenient that he or any of that kind should show themselves *peaceably* in public, some course was taken how he might be entertained in such places as he might come unto; we are now informed that he will not come, but that Broughen (Brechin) is in Edinburgh or thereabout: it is the advice of your friends here, that in a private way *some course may be taken for his terror and disgrace*, if he offer to shew himself in public. Think upon the best r—— by the advice of your friends there. I fear that this public appearance at Glasgow shall be prejudicial to our cause. We are going *to take order* with his chief supporters there, Gladstanes, Scrimgeour, and Halliburton. Wishing you both protection and direction from your master, I continue your own, whom you know.—G."[1]

Seeing that his life was in imminent danger, not only from the public act of the fanatical mob, but from the dagger of the private assassin, he fled to Newcastle, where he remained for some time. Here he wrote to the king, and earnestly solicited permission to resign his office of lord chancellor, which had been conferred on him for life by patent. Charles accepted his resignation, and wrote with his own hand an affectionate letter of thanks for his past services. Age, fatigue of body, and grief of soul, threw him into a fever, and on his recovery he retired to London, where he had a relapse. During his sickness he received the holy communion from the archbishop of Canterbury, and was visited by many persons of distinction. Among these, the marquis of Hamilton, who was generally supposed to be disaffected to episcopacy, waited on him, and said, "My lord, I come to kiss your lordship's hands, and humbly to ask your blessing." To which the primate replied, "My lord, you shall have my blessing; but give me leave to say, my lord, that I visibly foresee that the church and king are both in danger to be lost; and I am verily persuaded that there is none under God so able to prevent it as your lordship, and therefore I speak to you as a dying prelate, in the words of Mordecai to Esther, 'If you do it not, salvation in the end shall come somewhere else, but you and your house shall perish.'" The marquis answered, "that what he foresaw was his grief, and he wished from his heart he was able to do what was expected from him, though it were to be done with the sacrificing of his life and fortune;" after which, he received

[1] Cited in Bishop Russell's Hist. of the Church in Scotland, ii. 162.

the archbishop's blessing on his knees. Spottiswood left a written copy of the faith in which he died:—"I profess," he said, "that I believe all the articles of that ancient christian creed commonly called the Apostles' Creed; other additiments, which ignorance and presumption have superinduced into christianity, I simply refuse, beseeching God to purge his church from the errors and superstitions that have crept into the same, and at last to make us all that are called christians, the sheep of one fold. For matters of rites and ceremonies, my judgment is, and hath been, that the most simple, decent, and humble rites, should be chosen—such as the bowing of the knee in the receiving of the holy sacrament, with others of the like kind; profaneness being as dangerous to religion as superstition. As touching the government of the church, I am verily persuaded that the government episcopal is the only right and apostolic form: *parity among ministers* being the breeder of all confusion, as experience might have taught us. And as for the ruling elders, as they are a mere human device, so they will prove (when the way is more open to them) the ruin of both church and state." In the simplicity of this faith he lived, and died, in the month of December, 1639. His affectionate sovereign assigned him a tomb in Westminster Abbey, near his beloved master, king James; and his body was followed to the grave by all the loyal Scottish and English nobility then in London, with all the king's servants. The funeral procession, attended by 500 torches, was met at the west door by the dean and prebendaries in their robes, and he was buried according to the solemn rites of the church of England, "before the extermination of decent christian burial was come in fashion."

This eminent prelate contended more for the substance of piety than for its mere show—more for the power of godliness than its bare form. He was frequent and fervent in his private devotions, and in public worship his carriage was so exemplary as to excite the coldest congregation to unite with him in the same fervency and warmth of devotion. Few men suffered more from the insolence and opposition of his opponents, when sedition wore the colours of religion; and few men have suffered more in their character than this able and upright prelate, from the most malignant false witnesses who have attacked it. Baillie, the most moderate and temperate of his opponents, calls him *an infamous wretch*; "I was also content with another part of my task, to throw down to the dust of *just contempt* and *well-deserved disgrace* the unhappy and *infamous wretches*, Adamson, *Spottiswood*, Maxwell, and Balcanqual." His

public munificence was only bounded by his means. He built and adorned the parish church of Dairsie wholly at his own expense; and, in a time of famine in the Orkneys, he not only contributed largely himself to their relief, but he induced others to do the same[1]. Nalson says, "He was a person advanced for his merit to that high character which he supported with so great prudence, conduct, and integrity, as made it appear he deserved his honour and dignity. He came to the grave in peace and a good old age, and had the happiness not to be witness to those calamities and desolations which afterwards happened to his country[2]."

Bishop Keith represents archbishop Lindsay, of Glasgow, on the authority of some persons who knew him personally, to have been "both a good man and a very fervent preacher: that he exercised his office with much lenity, and was much against pressing the liturgy on the people." Baillie says, that he sent for lord Wemyss, "and intreated him to deal for *favour* towards him" with the Glasgow Assembly; and assured him "that he was pressed against his heart, by the commissioner and Bishop of Ross, to subscribe the declinature." The Assembly sent and pressed him to withdraw his signature from it, which he peremptorily *refused* to do; and they condemned him, "besides common faults, for the practice of the book of canons, the urging, under pain of horning [outlawry], the practice of the service-books," &c. It may therefore be concluded, that the report of his submission was a libel forged still further to blacken his character. He was both aged and in bad health, and he found it safest to retire to Newcastle, where he died in 1641[3].

David Lindsay, bishop of Edinburgh, was deposed and excommunicated upon the false declamatory charge of, "beside *common faults* of breaking the caveats[4], was proven to have been a presser of the late novations; an urger of the liturgy; a refuser to admit any of the ministry who would not first take the order of a preaching deacon; a bower to the altar; a wearer of the rochet; a consecrator of churches; a domineerer of presbyteries; a licenser of marriages without banns; a countenancer of corrupt doctrine; an elevator of the elements at consecration; a defender of ubiquity," &c. He was, like the other confessors, a maintainer of catholic doctrines and usages, and a man of exemplary private character. He also fled into England from the fury of the fanatics, who were hounded on by the lay chiefs and the presbyterian ministers. He died a few years afterwards, but it is not known where.

[1] Life, prefixed to his History.
[2] Impartial Collection, i. 286.
[3] Baillie's Letters.—Keith's Catalogue.
[4] Vide ante, ch. x. pp. 408-411.

"The proper faults of Adam Bellenden, of Aberdeen, were great slanders of frequent simony. Though he did not favour well enough all Canterbury's ways, yet he had been found as forward as any to press the canons and liturgy; that he suspended ministers for fasting on Sunday; that he enacted fasting on Wednesdays only; that he consecrated the chapel of an infamous woman, the lady Wardhouse; stayed, at his pleasure, processes against papists and incestuous persons; that he had not subscribed the declinature, as *was thought* for lack of no good will, but only through distance of place, the writ in time could not be conveyed to him. That defect in his process was *supplied* by the moderator with a discourse of his singularly malicious apostacy; that he had been a man by appearance, but too zealous against bishops, and all their courses, so that his vehemency beyond the grounds of any reason he knew did offend his wise and learned neighbour, Mr. Patrick Simpson. We decreed him to be excommunicat." His character may be gathered from the nature of the charges which were trumped up against him, and which may be measured by the rule of *contrary*. He likewise took shelter in the north of England, where he died soon after.

Walter Whitford, of that ilk, bishop of Brechin, was accused upon their usual evidence, the malicious gossip of their personal and official enemies. He was very desirous of encouraging the use of the liturgy, a fact which of itself is a contradiction to the calumnies of his enemies; but whose violence compelled him to consult his personal safety by retiring to England, where he died in the year 1643.

James Wedderburn, bishop of Dunblane, who had been formerly professor of divinity at St. Andrews, was excommunicated, "though he did not subscribe the declinature, neither was he personally summoned, having previously fled to England: yet was he excommunicated as one who had been an especial instrument of all our mischiefs, having corrupted with arminianism diverse with his discourses and lectures in St. Andrews, whose errors and perverseness kythe [show themselves] this day in all the nooks of the kingdom, having been a special penner, practiser, urger of our books, and of all novations; a man set in the chappel [royal, of which he was dean] to be a hand to Canterbury in all his intentions. What drunkenness, swearing, or other crimes were libelled, *I do not remember*." Catholic doctrines are here nicknamed arminianism; and it is evident that he had been a prelate who had exhorted and taught wholesome doctrine with all authority, and withstood and convinced the gainsayers. He had also been ready, with

all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word; and who, both privately and publicly, called upon and encouraged others to do the same. He died in 1639, at the early age of fifty-four, and was buried in the chapel of the Virgin Mary, in the Cathedral of Canterbury.

Of the fate of John Abernethy, bishop of Caithness, the accounts are rather conflicting. Baillie says, that he, with the bishop of Dunkeld, "simply submitted themselves to the synod, and requested to be continued in the office of the ministry. This their submission did obtain them favour, otherways there was truly alleged against them the *common faults*, and as foul pranks of simony and avarice as any of the former." Keith says, "by his writings, he seems to have been a man of good literature;" and good Mr. Skinner says, he died in exile: but Mr. David Laing, in a note to Baillie's Letters, of which he is the editor, calls this submission a "renunciation[1]," and is confirmed by Baillie, who says, he "simply submitted:" which means, that he acknowledged and obeyed their jurisdiction; and Dr. Hamilton, the bishops' procurator, was preferred to the see of Caithness, but he was never consecrated.

Neil Campbell, bishop of the Isles, was deposed, and threatened with excommunication, unless he repented; which, perhaps, he did, as we hear nothing more of him.

James Fairley, bishop of Argyle, "seemed as worthy of censure as any. In his small time he had shewn good will to go the worst ways of the faction, far contrary to the opinion which all men had of his orthodoxy and honesty: he was an urger on of the wicked oath on intrants, an intruder of the liturgy upon them, an oppressor of his vassals, a preacher of arminianism, a profaner of the Sabbath, and beginner to do all that Canterbury could have wished[2]. Notwithstanding his submission saved him; for he was deposed from his episcopal functions, and afterwards placed as presbyterian minister at Laswade.

John Guthrie, of that ilk, bishop of Moray, set a noble example of defiance to the covenanting Assembly, and suffered persecution as his reward. "Moray had all the *ordinary faults* of a bishop! besides his boldness to be the first to put on his sleeves [episcopal robes] in Edinburgh, did make many urge his excommunication, or to give token of repentance against such a day; but because he was not formally summoned, the moderator with some piece of violence kept him from that sentence[3]."

[1] Baillie's Letters, i. 166. [2] Ibid. i. 154. [3] Baillie's Letters, i. 164.

Nothwithstanding this slight favour, he was deposed, but he maintained the validity and rights of his order for two years at Spynie Castle, the episcopal palace of his see, till colonel Monroe took military possession of it, when he was obliged to retire to his own estate of Guthrie, in the county of Angus. One of the malicious and improbable stories trumped up against this worthy confessor, mentioned by Baillie, is, that "There was objected against him, *but, as I suspect, not sufficiently proven,* his countenancing a vile dance of naked people in his own house, and of women going barefooted in pilgrimage not far from his dwelling." This is cited to shew the vile spirit by which the Assembly was actuated, and not as for a moment admitting the truth of such an accusation. "He was," says bishop Keith, "a venerable, worthy, and hospitable prelate. After his deprivation, he was, by an act of that Assembly, appointed to make his public repentance in Edinburgh, because in the year 1633 he had preached in a surplice [query, lawn sleeves] before his majesty king Charles the First in the high church, to the great scandal of the zealous people there." If he refused to submit to this degradation, he was forthwith to be excommunicated. He despised their orders and their denunciations, and was accordingly excommunicated. He was fined, plundered, and imprisoned, yet still maintained his episcopal character, "till at last, being old and not likely to give the prevailing cause much trouble, he was suffered to die in quiet in his own house of Guthrie in Angus[1]."

John Maxwell, bishop of Ross, was a very learned man, with whom archbishop Laud contracted a firm and lasting friendship, by whose advice bishop Maxwell was made a privy councillor and an extraordinary lord of Session. The archbishop likewise intended that he should have been made lord treasurer, a step that excited the jealousy of lord Traquair and the envy of the nobility, and which proved prejudicial not only to himself and his order, but to the king also; for the nobility became discontented that the bishops should possess offices which they thought pertained hereditarily to themselves. His abilities and talents for affairs soon presented him as an object of envy and malice to the people generally; and so much was he feared, that the usurping government and the Assemblies retained his name in the condemned list of incendiaries so long as he lived, and always excepted him out of every act of oblivion or indemnity. In the Assembly "his process was

[1] Vide post, vol. ii.

no way perfect; the long legend of his erroneous doctrines was clean omitted. It was committed to Durie to search for witnesses of a number of errors which all knew he gloried to preach even in Edinburgh; but Durie's information came not in time: however, it was proven, that two years ago he was a public reader in his house and cathedral of the English liturgy; that he was a bower at the altar, a wearer of the cope and rochet, a deposer of godly ministers, an admitter of fornicators, a companier with papists, an usual carder on Sundays; yea, instead of going to thanksgiving on communion days, that he called for cards to play at the beast; had often given absolution, consecrated deacons, robbed his vassals of above forty thousand marks, kept fasts every Friday, journeyed usually on Sunday, had been a chief decliner of the Assembly, and a principal instrument in all troubles both of church and state. Of his excommunication no man made question." He fled to England, and was by the king translated to the bishopric of Killala in the year 1640, where he was again a sufferer from the other extreme—the papists in the time of their rebellion. The popish rebels stript him naked, wounded him severely, and left him for dead; but the earl of Thomond, who soon after passed by, recognised and took care of him, and brought him to Dublin without farther damage, where he greatly allayed the consternation of the people by his many excellent sermons. He waited on the king at Oxford, and gave him the first correct information respecting the miserable state of the kingdom of Ireland, and of the innate hatred which the Irish papists bore to the professors of the protestant religion. During his residence with the king, the archbishopric of Tuam falling void, he promoted him to that see by letters patent, dated 30th of August, 1645, and he soon after took possession of it. He was so grievously afflicted with the news of the king's misfortunes, and the calamities that had befallen the church, that he was found dead in his closet on his knees on the 14th of February, 1646, and was interred in Christ Church, Dublin, by the care of the marquis of Ormond.

Thomas Sydserf, bishop of Galloway, "a learned and worthy prelate," was deposed and excommunicated, and followed his brethren into England; thence he went to Paris, and exercised his episcopal office in the chapel of the king's ambassador there. He there ordained several priests, and among others John Durel, the author of the "View of the Reformed Churches Abroad;" in which work he says that the French protestants made a consistorial act, in which they agreed "not to pay any

regard to the Scotch presbyterian excommunications without a particular specification of a particular cause, which they did not admit episcopacy to be." In perfect consistency with this act, they communicated with bishop Sydserf, who had been excommunicated by the Scotch presbyterians, and they recognised the ordination which Durel and others received at his hands. It may be remarked that, although I have used the word *excommunicate* in the sense meant by the Assembly, yet I by no means admit their power to excommunicate, nor understand the bishops really to lie under that sentence which they do to this day, for it has never been reversed. But as the Assembly had the *civil power* on their side, their sentence carried with it all the civil pains and penalties which were competent to follow the lawful sentence; that is, of death and confiscation of property. Durel "quotes a letter written by the well-known Fredrick Spanheim, one of the ministers of Geneva, to the Irish primate Usher, to the English earl of Pembroke, and to two young Scotch noblemen, lord Angus and lord Maitland, with all of whom he had been acquainted when in Britain: in which, speaking in the name of the church, Spanheim has these words:—'With singular affection to all the British churches, we reverence and love their illustrious prelates, and we pray to God for the prosperity of these kingdoms, and of all them that sit at the helm, as well in the church as in the commonwealth, that God may have his glory, the king his just rights, and the prelates of your churches their due authority.' This letter, Mr. Durel says, was written in October, 1633. The date is observable, and shews us that, at the very time when the Scotch presbyterians, who glory in Geneva as their mother church and standard of reformation, were scheming against their own prelates both in person and office, that their mother church was reverencing and praying for them in both respects! To this let me add another letter, though some years later, from the same quarter, by the pen of another Genevan minister, the learned John Diodati, to the assembly of divines at Westminster in 1647; the whole strain of which is in praise of the church of England, sadly lamenting the unnatural tumults which were rending that once beautiful and pure church,—'that fair eye of the reformed churches, where the needy had been in use to find assistance, and the afflicted a refuge to fly to, &c.'[1]"

Bishop Sydserf was the only prelate who survived the "*ex-*

[1] Skinner's Eccl. Hist. ii. 348—349.

tirpation" of the church of Scotland. From the circumstance, perhaps, of their dispersion and the complete prostration of the civil and ecclesiastical powers, the prelates all died within two or three years of their exile, without making any provision whatever for preserving the succession; so that, with the solitary exception of bishop Sydserf, the church which had been founded by Spottiswood, and nourished by James and Charles as its royal nursing fathers, was really and truly extirpated by the blood-thirsty and malicious men who had sworn its destruction in their covenant. James Beaton, archbishop of Glasgow, who died possessed of that see in 1603, connected the ancient British and papal church with the Spottiswoodian; and Thomas Sydserf was the connecting link betwixt it and the present episcopal church in Scotland. We have the authoritative decision of the Glasgow Assembly that the Knoxian establishment was episcopal; and with the above connecting links, with only a vacancy of seven years, we see that, in point of fact, *episcopacy has never ceased to exist in Scotland*. It has ever been the subject of *persecution* in that kingdom. Three of its prelates have been murdered since the era of the reformation; and nine were obliged to flee for their lives, as threats of death were thundered out against them. The whole order have ever suffered that moral martyrdom "of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonments," which befel the saints of "whom the world was not worthy." The falsehoods of the charges against the bishops appear transparently in the exact similarity of the immoralities of which they were each falsely accused, much of which the accusers themselves acknowledge to be the mere rumour of malignant envy. Those three fallen stars who apostatized, through covetousness, to presbytery, were accused of the same list of immoralities as the others, and from which they were never absolved, but continued in their degraded ministry without even censure. This is another and a resistless proof that the infamous crimes adduced against the prelates were mere declamatory fabrications to blind and deceive the vulgar, to afford a specious cloak for their proceedings, and to round off their indictment.

These persecuted prelates have long since been gathered to their fathers, and, through the cross which they bore with exemplary patience, will, we fervently trust, receive the Crown of Righteousness, which the Lord, the Righteous Judge, shall give them, when, perhaps, their persecutors shall be calling on the rocks and mountains to cover them from

the wrath of the Chief Bishop. May they rest in peace! and may their successors in that long persecuted branch of Christ's holy catholic church "maintain and set forward, as much as shall lay in them, quietness, love, and peace among all men; and such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous, correct and punish according to such authority as they have by God's Word."

END OF VOL. I.

Wilson and Ogilvy, 57, Skinner Street, Snowhill, London.

AUG 75
N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA